Third Progress Report

on the Six-Point Action Plan for Strengthening Administration of Grants and Contributions

December 2000

Human Resources Development Canada
Développement des ressources humaines Canada

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary 2

Background 3

Continued Progress under the Six-Point Action Plan 4

The Auditor General's Report -- October 2000 5

Performance Tracking Results -- December 2000 7

Appendices:

Appendix 1	The Six-Point Action Plan to Strengthen Grants and Contributions -- Detailed Status Report -- January - November 2000
Appendix 2	HRDC Grants and Contributions Departmental Management Responses to Chapter 11 of the Auditor General's Report
Appendix 3	The National Grants and Contributions Performance Tracking Directorate, Second Quarterly Progress Report

Executive Summary

The Minister of Human Resources Development committed to report regularly to the public on the implementation of the Six-Point Action Plan to strengthen the administration of grants and contributions. The first two Progress Reports covered the period of January to August 2000.

This Third Progress Report covers the period of August to November 2000.

During this period of time, Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) has made substantial progress toward better administration of grants and contributions. Since August, the Department has:

- ✓ continued its implementation of the Six-Point Action Plan. Fourteen of the 38 sub-elements of the Action Plan relate to ongoing commitments, such as training staff and reporting to Parliament, and they are on schedule. Of the 24 remaining sub-elements, 22 are complete. The other two sub-elements relate to a review of closed or dormant files, which will be reported in the next Progress Report.
- ✓ developed a public website on grants and contributions, to ensure that Canadians have information about these programs, including eligibility criteria for potential applicants and sponsors and how to apply. This site will be available by December 31, 2000;
- ✓ provided program delivery training for over 1,100 employees. This is in addition to over 3,000 employees who received training under the Six-Point Action Plan on the fundamentals of financial control;
- ✓ responded to the recommendations contained in the Auditor General's Report on Grants and Contributions and committed to strengthen our initiatives in light of these recommendations; and
- ✓ released the *Second Report of the National Performance Tracking Directorate*. The report confirms that as these projects move through the mid-range of their lifecycle, *"the significant, measurable improvements in the overall program management and administration of grants and contributions ... identified in the first Performance Tracking Directorate Report have been sustained."*

Background

In 1999, Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) conducted an audit of project file documentation for seven grant and contribution programs. That audit found that contracting procedures, project monitoring and general financial practices needed improvement, prompting HRDC to take corrective action.

Since January 2000, a comprehensive management plan has been put in place to address the issues relating to grant and contribution programs. Over the last year, the Department has:

- ✓ launched a Six-Point Action Plan to strengthen the administration of grant and contribution programs;
- ✓ established a Performance Tracking Directorate to provide regular assessments of how well the Department is complying with required administrative practices;
- ✓ announced the winding-up of the Canada Jobs Fund to allow a clearer focus on the Department's core social policy mandate;
- ✓ responded to the June 2000 report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. This response is available at www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/dept/reports/engrep.pdf;
- ✓ developed a public website on grants and contributions, to ensure that Canadians have information about these programs, including eligibility criteria for potential applicants and sponsors and how to apply. This site will be available by December 31, 2000;
- ✓ reorganized the Department's internal structure and practices to improve management and accountability; and
- ✓ initiated a program management study to ensure that the objectives of all grant and contribution programs are clearly defined and that performance measures are in place to demonstrate how well these objectives are met.

The Department continues to meet its commitment to report on progress in implementing the Six-Point Action Plan. The first Progress Report, issued in May 2000, confirmed that all active and audited grant and contribution files had been reviewed and that the required documentation had been put in order. The second Progress Report, issued in August 2000, described actions taken to strengthen management and accountability structures within the Department and the introduction of a quality assurance process for grants and contributions. It also included the first Performance Tracking report, which showed significant, measurable improvement in program management and administration of grants and contributions.

This third report, which covers the period of August to November 2000, focuses on three items:

- ✓ continued progress made under the Six-Point Action Plan;
- ✓ the commitments made by the Department in response to the report of the Auditor General on HRDC grants and contributions;
- ✓ the most recent report of the Department's Performance Tracking Directorate.

Continued Progress under the Six-Point Action Plan

The Six-Point Action Plan

1. Ensure payments meet financial and program requirements
2. Check and correct problem files
3. Equip and support staff
4. Ensure accountability
5. Get the best advice available
6. Report progress to the public

The Six-Point Action Plan was launched in January 2000 to address serious deficiencies identified in the 1999 Internal Audit. Results to date suggest that it has significantly strengthened the administration of grants and contributions at HRDC.

The Department has continued to implement the Six-Point Action Plan. Fourteen of the 38 sub-elements of the Action Plan relate to on-going commitments, such as training staff and reporting to Parliament, and they are on schedule. Of the 24 remaining sub-elements, 22 are complete. The other two sub-elements relate to a review of closed or dormant files – files on projects that were completed in 1998-99 or 1999-2000. This work and the decision to examine additional dormant files will be completed and reported on in the next Progress Report.

The Six-Point Action Plan has resulted in major accomplishments since January 2000.

- ✓ HRDC staff have been given clear direction on the documentation and procedures that must be in place to issue payments to sponsors.
- ✓ Every one of 17,000 active files was reviewed between February and April 2000 to ensure that they fully meet program requirements and file management standards.
- ✓ All 461 files examined in the 1999 internal audit were reviewed and closed.

measurable improvement in program management and administration of grants and contributions.

This third report, which covers the period of August to November 2000, focuses on three items:

- ✓ continued progress made under the Six-Point Action Plan;
- ✓ the commitments made by the Department in response to the report of the Auditor General on HRDC grants and contributions;
- ✓ the most recent report of the Department's Performance Tracking Directorate.

Continued Progress under the Six-Point Action Plan

The Six-Point Action Plan

1. Ensure payments meet financial and program requirements
2. Check and correct problem files
3. Equip and support staff
4. Ensure accountability
5. Get the best advice available
6. Report progress to the public

The Six-Point Action Plan was launched in January 2000 to address serious deficiencies identified in the 1999 Internal Audit. Results to date suggest that it has significantly strengthened the administration of grants and contributions at HRDC.

The Department has continued to implement the Six-Point Action Plan. Fourteen of the 38 sub-elements of the Action Plan relate to on-going commitments, such as training staff and reporting to Parliament, and they are on schedule. Of the 24 remaining sub-elements, 22 are complete. The other two sub-elements relate to a review of closed or dormant files – files on projects that were completed in 1998-99 or 1999-2000. This work and the decision to examine additional dormant files will be completed and reported on in the next Progress Report.

The Six-Point Action Plan has resulted in major accomplishments since January 2000.

- ✓ HRDC staff have been given clear direction on the documentation and procedures that must be in place to issue payments to sponsors.
- ✓ Every one of 17,000 active files was reviewed between February and April 2000 to ensure that they fully meet program requirements and file management standards.
- ✓ All 461 files examined in the 1999 internal audit were reviewed and closed.

- ✓ Employees have been supported through the provision of clear policies, improved work instruments, a training needs-assessment, new training courses on all aspects of project administration, and improved information-management systems. In addition to the 3,000 employees who received training under the Six-Point Action Plan on the fundamentals of financial control in January and February 2000, more than 1,100 program delivery officers have attended formal departmental courses since April 2000. An additional 780 managers have attended a modern comptrollership course since August.

- ✓ A new quality-assurance process is being implemented to detect and correct errors in program delivery at the earliest possible time.

- ✓ The National Performance Tracking Directorate has published two assessment reports on departmental performance on grants and contributions. The details of its second report are appended to this report.

In the last Progress Report, HRDC released the results of an external review of the implementation of the Action Plan. This review, by PricewaterhouseCoopers, concluded that HRDC was on track with respect to the commitments in the plan. A further review will be undertaken in early 2001.

Since August, the Department has, through the Action Plan, undertaken the following:

- ✓ Implementation across the Department of the new Treasury Board Policy on Transfer Payments;
- ✓ Development and implementation of an enhanced operations manual; and
- ✓ Implementation of a revised departmental training policy, identifying mandatory training courses for program delivery staff.

A chart detailing the implementation of all the elements of the Six-Point Action Plan forms Appendix 1 to this report.

The Auditor General's Report – October 2000

On October 17, 2000, the Auditor General released his report on the management of grants and contributions at HRDC.

The Auditor General's report noted that the audit's *"findings show that up to December 1999, there were unacceptable weaknesses in the control framework for the management of Grants and Contributions at Human Resources Development Canada."* The Auditor General also observed that *"HRDC has initiated corrective actions that address the deficiencies we found in our audit."*

The Auditor General endorsed the corrective action taken by the Department and its work on additional initiatives that expand or complement the original action plan.

The Department, in its management response to the Report of the Auditor General, stated its determination to build on the improvements it had already made to its administration of these programs. Specifically, the Department made the following commitments:

- ✓ HRDC will work closely with all stakeholders, including the Treasury Board Secretariat, to prepare a report on the balance between effective program delivery and sound financial controls. HRDC will report by June 2001 to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities on the Department's comprehensive efforts in achieving the right balance.
- ✓ HRDC will publish the results of its review of a sample of closed or dormant files. This review was expanded following the recommendations of the Auditor General. The results of this review will be completed and reported on in the next Progress Report.
- ✓ HRDC will ensure that descriptions of all programs, including terms and conditions, eligibility requirements and information on how to apply are available on its public web site, in every HRDC office, and to every Member of Parliament. This site will be available by December 31, 2000.
- ✓ HRDC will expand the program management study to incorporate a more thorough review of how program design and program information can support equality of access for those who are eligible to apply.

> ***"Management of HRDC is making good progress in meeting the commitments made in the Six-Point Action Plan and other plans formulated to correct identified problems."***
>
> *Auditor General's Report, Chapter 11, page 79*

The Auditor General emphasized the need for HRDC to sustain its efforts and attention if it is to achieve the systemic change the Action Plan envisions. The Auditor General noted, *"the Department needs to make today's extraordinary effort tomorrow's routine and fundamentally change its day-to-day approach to the delivery of grants and contributions."* HRDC has fully accepted the Auditor General's challenge.

The complete Management Response to the Auditor General's Report on Grants and Contributions at HRDC forms Appendix 2 to this report.

Performance Tracking Results – December 2000

HRDC established a Performance Tracking Directorate in the fall of 1999 to examine and report quarterly on how well the Department is complying with program terms and conditions, and policies.

Over time, the reviews will give a complete indication of whether the Department has met and maintained the standards it has set for itself as projects mature through key elements of their lifecycle. This cycle begins when an application is received and continues until the file is closed.

> ***"The performance tracking system the Department has developed to monitor progress is an innovative approach to ongoing performance measurement. If applied systematically, it should give management a good measure of the progress being made."***
>
> *Report of the Auditor General, Chapter 11, pages 31-32*

In its first report published in August, the National Performance Tracking Directorate concluded that the Department had made significant progress in the administration of grants and contributions. As these files were drawn from early in their lifecycle, the results were statistically valid for: the application, recommendation and approval, and contracting phases of the cycle.

> ***"The significant, measurable improvements in the overall program management and administration of grants and contributions since the 1999 IAB Audit identified in the first Performance Tracking Directorate Report have been sustained..."***
>
> *Second Report of the Performance Tracking Directorate, December 2000*

The Performance Tracking report of December 2000 is based on a random sample of 274 additional files drawn from a population of 2,460 grant and contribution agreements with start dates between February 1 and April 30, 2000. As these files were further advanced in their life cycle, the tracking results are statistically significant for all phases of the project cycle except for follow up and evaluation. These will be assessed in later reports.

The review performed by the National Performance Tracking Directorate clearly indicates:

- ✓ significant, measurable improvements in the overall program management and administration of grants and contributions have been sustained;
- ✓ a high level of compliance with departmental and Treasury Board policies and procedures;

- ✓ a compliance rate of 90 per cent or above for 44 of 54 assessment factors that are statistically valid at the national level; and
- ✓ an increased level of financial and program documentation in support of the application, contracting and payment processes.

The National Performance Tracking Directorate Report has identified the following areas for further improvement:

- ✓ adherence to the requirement to input commitments in the HRDC accounting system before agreements are signed;
- ✓ more complete file documentation on the assessment of the applicants'/sponsors' proposed project costs;
- ✓ more thorough completion of the schedules and basis of payments in the agreement; and
- ✓ guidelines that clarify the nature and scope of activities that meet program terms and conditions.

In response to the National Performance Tracking Directorate Report, the Department has put into place additional measures that will have a positive impact on future results. These include:

- ✓ implementing a "model" contributions project file available for all employees to consult;
- ✓ developing and implementing a new HRDC training policy;
- ✓ introducing an enhanced operations manual to better ensure consistent practices are observed across the Department; and
- ✓ developing a revised organizational structure for regional and local offices relating to grants and contributions.

In conclusion, the National Performance Tracking Directorate continues to support the Department's commitment that grant and contribution programs are well administered and meet the standards of administration that Canadians expect.

The complete National Performance Tracking Directorate report forms Appendix 3 of this report.

Appendix 1

The Six-Point Action Plan to Strengthen Grants and Contributions -- Detailed Status Report -- January - November 2000

Section 1 – Ensure Payments Meet Financial and Program Requirements

Action Plan Commitment	Status
1.1 Directives will be issued that no payments will be made without written verification that five essential criteria are met	√ Complete – directive issued in January 2000
1.2 Follow-up training will be provided to ensure good understanding of this directive by all program delivery and financial staff	√ Complete – follow-up training delivered to more than 3,000 employees in February 2000
1.3 Confirmation of program criteria (differentiated by program as needed) to be met in reviewing active and new files for completeness	√ Complete – comprehensive checklist issued in February 2000
1.4 Review of all active contribution agreements to ensure files are complete (i.e., meet essential financial and program criteria)	√ Complete – all active files were reviewed by April 30, 2000
1.5 Track performance by conducting regular monitoring - includes review of a sample of active files and field visits	Ongoing – the National Performance Tracking Directorate has issued two quarterly reports in August and December 2000. Both reports show significant and measurable improvement to the administration of grants and contributions

Section 2 – Check and Correct Problem Files

Action Plan Commitment	Status
2.1 Review 37 files flagged for further analysis and carry out needed follow up, if any	√ Complete – all files were reviewed by March 14, 2000
2.2 Develop cost-effective screening method for reviewing closed files for 99-00 and 98-99 to identify those most likely to require further analysis; method to be reviewed independently	√ Complete – screening methodology developed in March 2000
2.3 Apply screening method, review files, and complete follow up as needed	In progress – the dormant file review is now scheduled for completion in January 2001
2.4 Based on effectiveness of this review, determine (with independent advice) the cost-effectiveness of reviewing earlier closed files	In progress – the decision on reviewing additional files will be made following the completion of the dormant file review
2.5 In all cases, whatever action is warranted will be taken (e.g. establish and recover overpayments, refer for further investigation)	Ongoing – in all cases appropriate steps are being taken to establish and collect overpayments

Section 3 – Equip and Support Our Staff

Action Plan Commitment	Status
3.1 Provide direction, tools, training and additional resources as needed	√ Complete – operational policies have been developed and implemented as required, such as the guidelines on appropriate use of programs in June 2000 and the national project monitoring policy in September; new TB Policy on Transfer Payments implemented in September
3.2 Seek the views and concerns of program and financial staff at NHQ, regional and local offices regarding issues relating to the management of Gs and Cs; incorporate the results as appropriate	√ Complete – formal staff consultations were held in April; staff feedback continues to be reflected in operational policy, work instruments, and training courses
3.3 Provide better tools (including better information systems), to simplify management and monitoring of projects	Ongoing – program delivery staff have improved tools to assist them in delivering grants and contributions, such as the contribution project file (September 2000), an information pamphlet for sponsors (July 2000), and a new operations manual (October 2000); improvements to departmental information systems are on schedule

Section 3 – Equip and Support Our Staff (cont'd)

Action Plan Commitment	Status
3.4 Assess workload and staff capacity associated with renewing the management of grants and contributions, and determine resource, classification, staffing, and training needs	√ Complete - $50 million was reallocated in July 2000 from within existing budgets to increase the number of staff to administer grants and contributions; new structures were developed in June 2000 for local office delivery, including the establishment of senior operational consultants in large HRCCs; a new quality assurance process was implemented in June 2000 to detect and correct errors at the earliest possible time
3.5 Determine needs and conduct training to ensure staff have the knowledge necessary to carry out the tasks expected	Ongoing – a training needs identification instruments was implemented in August 2000; a national training policy was implemented in November 2000 specifying mandatory training courses for program delivery staff; a full suite of new and updated training modules are now available for program delivery staff; 1100 staff have already participated in these courses; an additional 780 managers have attended an Introduction to Modern Comptrollership course
3.6 Arrange temporary additional resources to support the Action Plan, including strengthening the Grants and Contributions Management Renewal	√ Complete – temporary resources were made available for the active file review in February and March 2000; a national project team was established

Office	in February 2000 to co-ordinate implementation of the Six-Point Action Plan
3.7 Assess staff response as a standing item on National Management Board Agenda	√ Complete – staff response reviewed and acted on throughout the implementation of the Action Plan

Section 4 – Ensure Accountability for Results

Action Plan Commitment	Status
4.1 Make requirement to implement Action Plan part of basic job requirements for all Exs and other managers involved in managing grants and contributions	√ Complete – all departmental executives with responsibility for grants and contributions are explicitly accountable for implementing the Action Plan
4.2 Report quarterly to Minister in two parts • report on the National Performance Tracking Directorate • report on progress against the Action Plan	Ongoing – Progress Reports issued in May, August and December; National Performance Tracking Directorate reports released in August and December
4.3 Report to Parliament through Committee and through the Plans and Priorities document and Departmental Performance Report	Ongoing – departmental officials testified at the Standing Committee between February and May 2000; the Government responded to the Standing Committee's June report in October 2000
4.4 Review and confirm or amend accountability and management structures and work processes (including segregation of duties, post-audits) relating to grants and contributions, to ensure clarity and effectiveness	√ Complete – structural changes introduced in local offices in June 2000 to add a quality assurance process and to increase expertise available to program delivery staff; post-audit re-introduced in June 2000

Section 4 – Ensure Accountability for Results (cont'd)

Action Plan Commitment	Status
4.5 Eliminate all instances of computer users having more than one active code	√ Complete – all instances eliminated in February 2000
4.6 Keep staff informed through monthly progress bulletins	Ongoing – departmental staff are kept informed by closed-circuit TV broadcasts and periodic bulletins
4.7 Report every other week to regional national senior managers' conference call (standing item)	√ Complete – national conference calls were held on major implementation issues
4.8 Assess cost-benefit of applying ISO 9000 or similar quality assurance tool	√ Complete – assessment completed in February 2000; ISO 9002 pilot now underway in Prince Edward Island
4.9 Get outside expert advice to assess and comment on adequacy of progress on the Action Plan	Ongoing – interim assessment by PricewaterhouseCoopers in June 2000 showed all major commitments on schedule; final assessment due in early 2001

Section 5 – Get the Best Advice Available

Action Plan Commitment	Status
5.1 Consult with TB Comptrollership Standards Advisory Board, the Office of the Auditor General, and key DM colleagues, and incorporate their advice into the Action Plan	√ Complete – consultations completed in January 2000 and advice incorporated into the Action Plan
5.2 Obtain an independent assessment of the Action Plan from a senior private sector financial expert	√ Complete – independent advice incorporated in January 2000
5.3 Exchange information and best practices with other federal departments that manage significant grants and contributions programs	Ongoing – HRDC has consulted other departments and exchanged best practices on the administration of grants and contributions
5.4 Draw on expertise of experienced HRDC local, regional and national staff	√ Complete – the project team implementing the Six-Point Action Plan was drawn from local, regional, and national staff
5.5 Review progress quarterly with co-chairs (or delegates) of the TB Comptrollership Standards Advisory Board	√ Complete – consultations completed
5.6 Meet monthly with the Assistant Auditor General to review progress	Ongoing – senior departmental officials consult regularly with staff of the Office of the Auditor General and cooperated fully during the AG's audit; the AG reported that "HRDC is making good progress in meeting the commitments made in the Six-Point Action Plan."

Section 6 – Report Progress to Public and Staff

Action Plan Commitment	Status
6.1 External – inform sponsors and partners of plans and progress	√ Complete – HRDC staff informed sponsors of departmental plans in February 2000 and have subsequently kept sponsors informed of progress
6.2 External – brief the press on quarterly reports	Ongoing – Progress Reports, National Performance Tracking Directorate Reports, the Government response to the Standing Committee, and HRDC's management response to the Auditor General have been released to the media and published on HRDC's web site
6.3 External – correct misinformation as appropriate	Ongoing
6.4 Internal – Minister and DM to speak to all program delivery staff about Action Plan, using closed-circuit TV	Ongoing – staff have been kept informed using closed-circuit TV and bulletins
6.5 Internal – develop a communications strategy that will provide regular communications with all staff using a variety of formats including bulletins, web site, close-circuit TV, etc.	√ Complete – communications strategy developed in February 2000

6.6 Internal – DM and Associate DM will schedule roundtable discussions with a cross-section of staff on all visits to regional or local offices	Ongoing – regular discussions have been held in local and regional offices across the country

Appendix 2

HRDC Grants and Contributions Departmental Management Responses to Chapter 11 of the Auditor General's Report

Chapter 11
HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT CANADA GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

Department's overall comment: The Department takes seriously all the issues raised in the chapter and in the 1999 internal audit of grant and contribution programs.

The Department is determined to build on the improvements it has already made to its administration of grant and contribution programs. HRDC will fulfil its Action Plan. It will complete the other supporting initiatives undertaken following the launch of the Plan. Furthermore, HRDC is undertaking additional steps to strengthen these actions in response to this chapter.

The challenge, as confirmed by the Auditor General, is to achieve the right balance between efficient and flexible program delivery and sound financial management. The Auditor General's report will help the Department consistently achieve program delivery that meets the needs of the Canadians it serves as well as the sound financial management that Canadians expect.

This chapter recognizes that the Department has made good progress with respect to the Six-Point Action Plan and related initiatives. It also emphasizes the need for HRDC to sustain the changes that are under way. HRDC acknowledges the need to undertake continuous work in this respect. As a result, HRDC will more explicitly incorporate the principles of modern comptrollership, or managing for excellence, as an ongoing foundation for the fundamental changes being made to its administration of grant and contribution programs.

By strengthening and integrating its work on modern comptrollership, the Department will be well positioned to fully respond to the Auditor General's statement that HRDC "needs to make today's extraordinary effort tomorrow's routine." This work will also help promote a culture of continuous learning and improvement.

In response to this chapter, HRDC will take a number of further steps. Specifically:

- HRDC commits to working closely with all stakeholders, including the Treasury Board Secretariat, in the preparation of a report on the balance between effective program delivery and sound financial controls. HRDC will report by June 2001 to the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities on the Department's comprehensive efforts in achieving the right balance.

- HRDC confirms that it will publish the results of the review of a sample of dormant files this fall. The Department will also engage an independent expert to examine its review and advise whether in accordance with the principle of due diligence it is cost-effective to assess additional files. This is consistent with HRDC's commitment to being open and transparent in the implementation of the Action Plan and the administration of grant and contribution programs.

- HRDC will ensure that by December 2000, descriptions of all programs, including terms and conditions, eligibility requirements, and information on how to apply, are available on its public Web site, in every HRDC office, and to every member of Parliament. This action responds to the Auditor General's observations about the need to ensure that information about programs is widely available and accessible.

- HRDC is expanding the program management study to incorporate a more thorough review of how program design and program information can support equality of access to programs.

In reviewing the chapter, HRDC is pleased that the Auditor General recognizes the following:

- that the Department's "actions and plans also address the deficiencies we found in our audit";

- that the Department "has made good progress toward meeting the commitments in its Six-Point Action Plan" and that "work is also proceeding on additional initiatives that expand or complement the original Action Plan;" and

- that the HRDC "Performance Tracking Directorate represents good progress. If properly implemented, it should give management an ongoing measure of performance in the management and control of grants and contributions."

HRDC also notes that:

- the Auditor General's audit was based on files that were closed before January 2000. Therefore, with the exception of a few projects that had been extended, the period covered by the Auditor General's audit precedes the corrective action by the Department;

- the Department has asked for the advice of the Standing Committee on any changes that might strengthen the project selection process in relation to grant and contribution programs. This will include the role of members of Parliament, who are well placed to advise on the various interests of the communities they represent; and

- with respect to efficiency, flexibility and control, the Auditor General recognized that "there is no simple answer to what the balance should be."

The Report acknowledges the broad range of initiatives HRDC has taken since the internal audit was conducted in 1999. In this respect, the Department has:

- launched a Six-Point Action Plan to strengthen administration of grant and contribution programs, including the establishment of the Performance Tracking Directorate to assess adherence to policies, and the provision of extensive training and better tools to staff;
- complied with the new Treasury Board Policy on Transfer Payments to further strengthen the administration of grant and contribution programs;
- introduced a new quality assurance process to detect and correct errors at the earliest possible time;
- initiated actions to improve accountability structures and management processes within the Department;
- released two progress reports and the response to the Standing Committee report of June 2000; and
- initiated a comprehensive program management study to ensure that the objectives of all grant and contribution programs are clearly defined and that performance measures are in place to demonstrate that these objectives are met.

In summary HRDC confirms its commitment in making fundamental and permanent improvements to the management and administration of its grant and contribution programs. HRDC will continue to work with all interested parties to ensure that it achieves the right balance between responsive client service and prudent management of taxpayers' money.

Recommendation 1 (paragraph 11.149)

The Department should put in place quality control measures to review corrective actions, and ongoing monitoring to ensure that staff have a solid understanding of the fundamentals of financial control. Using such an approach, the Department should ensure that all overpayments from problem files and high-risk dormant files are properly identified and recovered.

Department's response: HRDC agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

The Department had acknowledged the need for ongoing monitoring to ensure that staff have a solid understanding of the fundamentals of financial control. This is being addressed through two measures: a new quality assurance process and the Performance Tracking Directorate. These are permanent processes and structures to detect and correct problem files, and to identify and correct deficiencies in operational policy, procedures, and employee knowledge and skills.

The new quality assurance initiative was undertaken in June 2000 to increase program expertise at the local office level. New senior operations consultants will now conduct a quality review of selected files to identify problems at the earliest possible time. In addition, financial administrators and program delivery staff have re-established a financial post-audit program at the national and regional office levels. This financial post-audit program includes the validation of expenditures in order to allow financial officers assurance that payments are in support of services provided or goods received in accordance with the prescribed policies and procedures. When either of these processes detect a problem file, it will be corrected and an adjustment or overpayment established if required.

HRDC also established a Performance Tracking Directorate, which is sampling a statistically valid selection of project files from across the country. Errors, when detected, are returned to the appropriate office for correction and establishment of an overpayment if necessary. In addition, patterns and trends are communicated to all offices delivering grant and contribution programs with appropriate guidance and direction to reduce or eliminate such errors in the future.

The Department recognizes the importance of identifying potential overpayments and subjecting such problem cases to careful and consistent review. As part of the Six-Point Action Plan, HRDC has identified and reviewed a sample of dormant files from 1998-99 and 1999-2000. As recommended by the Auditor General, the Department has since added a quality control step to this process. Following the review by program delivery staff, Internal Audit Bureau staff have been scrutinizing the work and conducting selected on-site reviews of higher risk projects to ensure that all potential overpayments are identified and established.

The results of the dormant file review will be published this fall 2000. In addition, HRDC will engage a private sector consulting firm to examine the Department's work and advise whether in accordance with the principle of due diligence it is cost-effective to review additional files.

Recommendation 2 (paragraph 11.150)

The Department should ensure that key controls are strengthened as it committed to do so in the Six-Point Action Plan and that they are supported by a strong internal audit function that meets the highest professional standards. The Department should also ensure that it has a well-established system for implementing and following up on corrective action resulting from internal audits.

Department's response: HRDC agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

The Department continues to be committed to implementing the Six-Point Action Plan, including key control processes and mechanisms. As demonstrated in the two progress reports issued in May and September, HRDC is reporting publicly on its achievement of the Action Plan and will continue to do so until the Plan is implemented in its entirety. In addition, as indicated in the government's response to the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, HRDC is committed to reporting on the impact of its corrective measures in future departmental performance reports. HRDC has already contracted PricewaterhouseCoopers to conduct a second independent assessment of the implementation of the Action Plan in January 2001.

The Department has a professional Internal Audit Bureau in place and has recently acted to strengthen the role and profile of internal audit through a renewed Departmental Audit and Evaluation committee. This committee, which is one of five main executive committees, is responsible for ensuring that the Department takes corrective action on all internal audit recommendations. This action will also promote a culture of continuous learning from audits and evaluations.

Although not a part of the Department's Internal Audit Bureau, HRDC has budgeted $2.7 million annually for the national Grant and Contribution Performance Tracking Directorate. This directorate provides a consistent and continuous measurement of HRDC's compliance with file documentation requirements and fundamental financial controls. In its first report in August 2000, the Directorate confirmed that "there has been a significant, measurable improvement in overall program management and administration of grants and contributions since the 1999 internal audit." The Department has committed to publishing performance tracking results quarterly.

Recommendation 3 (paragraph 11.151)

The Department should complete its study of program management, which is designed to ensure that desired results of grant and contribution programs are clearly defined and that results are appropriately measured and used to identify any necessary changes. In consultation with the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Department should ensure that it meets its proposed time frame for analyzing the objectives of all its grant and contribution programs and implementing appropriate changes, including measurement of results.

Department's response: The Department agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

In May 2000, HRDC embarked on an extensive program management study that is designed to review the management and results focus of all grant and contribution programs within the Department. This study is intended to strengthen program management and performance by:

- developing results-based management and accountability frameworks for all programs;
- improving communication on lessons learned across programs; and
- ensuring all program authorities comply with the reporting requirements set out in the Social Union Framework Agreement.

Above all, the program management study will ensure that all programs have clear objectives that shape the design and direction of the program and that they have an integrated audit and evaluation cycle. In addition, HRDC is expanding the study to incorporate a more thorough review of how program design and program information can support equality of access to programs.

This work will result in an enhanced departmental capacity to improve HRDC's grant and contribution programs. It will establish a cycle of continuous improvement in policy and program design as well as program management and administration.

This work is being carried out in co-operation with the Treasury Board Secretariat. In June 2000, the Treasury Board introduced a revised Policy on Transfer Payments to promote long-term, government-wide improvements to grant and contribution program administration. The new policy requires departments to review and resubmit their program authorities by 31 March 2005.

HRDC is fast tracking this work. As part of the program management study, all HRDC programs will have reassessed and strengthened their design, management, and accountability frameworks by 31 March 2001. The Department will then resubmit all grant and contribution program authorities to the Treasury Board by the end of 2002.

Recommendation 4 (paragraph 11.152)

The Department should assess whether the information it provides to Canadians on grant and contribution programs adequately promotes equality of access, and it should take corrective action as required.

Department's response: The Department agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

The Department is presently using a range of methods and techniques to provide information in a manner that promotes equality of access. In addition, HRDC is taking steps to increase the information available to Canadians on its grant and contribution programs and to make this information more accessible.

Specifically, HRDC will ensure that by December 2000, descriptions of all programs, including terms and conditions, eligibility requirements, and information on how to apply, is available on its public Web site, in every HRDC office, and to every member of Parliament.

HRDC will examine this issue further as part of the program management study referred to in the response following paragraph 11.151 and will specifically document in the program design process the accessibility and equality of access requirements.

For many of these programs, HRDC believes that it will be important to consider the role of a consultative process in the community that reaches all prospective sponsors and that complements the information provided to all Canadians on its programs.

Recommendation 5 (paragraph 11.153)

The Department should ensure that management sustains its current strong support for change to ensure that actions to equip and support staff are fully implemented and the required tools and systems provided. It should conduct ongoing monitoring of the impacts of the new tools and training and the concepts and approaches being implemented. It should also ensure that the new information system for grants and contributions is fully integrated with the Department's financial system.

Department's response: HRDC agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

As recognized by the PricewaterhouseCoopers independent assessment of the Department's implementation of the Action Plan, "substantial senior level management involvement has been devoted to ensure progress in achieving the various activities that support the commitments under each of the six points of the Plan." Continuing management support is assured through measures taken in April establishing explicit accountability in implementing the Six-Point Action Plan for every executive with responsibility for a grant and contribution program.

In addition, HRDC has committed to reporting publicly on a quarterly basis until the Plan is implemented, and to report annually on the impact of its corrective measures in the Departmental Performance Report to Parliament.

The Department recognizes the importance of well-trained and well-equipped staff in delivering grant and contribution programs. As indicated in the Department's Progress Reports and in the Government response to the Standing Committee, HRDC has fulfilled Action Plan commitments and taken additional initiatives to provide staff with appropriate operational policy guidance, standardized training, and improved information management systems. The Department specifically commits to monitoring and assessing the impact of operational policies and training, and to ensuring that the new information systems for grant and contribution programs are fully integrated with the departmental financial system.

Recommendation 6 (paragraph 11.154)

In collaboration with the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Department should complete a workload analysis of the resources required to deliver different types of grant and contribution programs.

Department's response: HRDC agrees with this recommendation and has taken action.

As indicated in the response to the Standing Committee, HRDC reallocated resources in July from within its existing budget to increase the number of staff with specific responsibility for the administration of grant and contribution programs. This reallocation was based on a preliminary analysis of staffing, training and systems requirements. HRDC has since undertaken a comprehensive analysis of workload, which will be completed by December 2000.

In the fall 2000, the Department is also initiating a third-party review of delivery models for grant and contribution programs. This review will assess HRDC's delivery structure in relation to those of other federal departments and will assess the appropriate balance between local, regional, and national delivery of grant and contribution programs. This review will take into account the variety of HRDC programs, the nature of partnership agreements resulting from the *Employment Insurance Act* and the Social Union Framework Agreement, and the existing capacity within the Department.

These reviews will be the basis for further discussions with the Treasury Board Secretariat concerning the Department's resource requirements in delivering grant and contribution programs.

FOLLOWING 11.385

Department's Summary Comments: HRDC takes seriously all the issues raised in the Auditor General's report and in the 1999 internal audit of grant and contribution programs. The Department is determined to build on the improvements it has already made. HRDC will fulfil its Action Plan. It will complete the other supporting initiatives undertaken following the launch of the Plan. Furthermore, HRDC is undertaking additional steps to strengthen these actions in response to this report. HRDC will continue to work with all interested parties to ensure that it achieves the right balance between responsive client service and prudent management of taxpayers' money.

The Department's response to specific recommendations and its overall comment are included in Part I of the chapter, following paragraph 11.149.

Appendix 3

The National Grants and Contributions Performance Tracking Directorate, Second Quarterly Progress Report

Human Resources Development Canada
Développement des ressources humaines Canada

The National Grants and Contributions

Performance Tracking Directorate

Second Quarterly Progress Report

Copyright 2000. Human Resources Development Canada.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 OBJECTIVES 1

3 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY 2

4 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS 3

4.1 *FILE REVIEW CONCLUSIONS* 3

4.2 *FINANCIAL SUMMARY* 4

5 NEXT STEPS 4

ANNEX A - NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS 5

APPLICATION 5

ASSESSMENT 5

RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL 5

CONTRACTING 5

PAYMENTS 6

MONITORING 7

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS 7

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 7

OTHER PTD RESULTS 8

ANNEX B - NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS - DETAILED RESULTS 9

APPLICATION 9

ASSESSMENT 11

RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVAL 13

CONTRACTING 14

PAYMENTS 19

MONITORING 22

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS AND CONDITIONS 24

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 25

ANNEX C - FINANCIAL VERIFICATION 27

DETAILED RESULTS 27

FINANCIAL REVIEW CONCLUSIONS 28

ANNEX D - PROGRAM ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS 29

LABOUR MARKET 29

YOUTH 34

LEARNING & LITERACY 39

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS 44

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS 49

LABOUR 54

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS 58

1 INTRODUCTION

Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) established the National Grants and Contributions Performance Tracking Directorate (PTD) in the fall of 1999 to support the work of strengthening the administration of grants and contributions in HRDC. The Directorate provides a quality control mechanism for HRDC to measure its improvement in the administration of grant and contribution programs. The Directorate is part of the Financial and Administrative Services Branch of HRDC.

The Directorate's mandate is to:

- provide assurance that grant and contribution funds are being managed and expended in accordance with program terms and conditions;
- highlight key areas of risk and provide guidance on approaches to mitigate those risks;
- contribute to knowledge transfer throughout the department; and
- coordinate activities with other monitoring and post-audit functions carried out within HRDC and by external agencies to ensure adequate coverage, without duplication of effort.

PTD reviews provide the Department with ongoing and detailed information on its level of compliance with required and expected administrative standards for grants and contributions. Over time the reviews will demonstrate whether the Department is meeting and maintaining the standards it has set for itself through the Six-Point Action Plan on Grants and Contributions.

The second quarterly progress report contains the results of the assessment carried out between July and December 2000. The files selected for review were drawn from grant and contribution agreements with a start date between February 1 and April 30, 2000. The report measures improvements made by HRDC up to April 30, 2000. It should be recognized that the Department has taken additional measures to implement its Action Plan since then through:

- the creation and national distribution of a "model file" setting specific file documentation standards;
- the establishment of a national question and answer service;
- the drafting of an operations manual;
- the strengthening of HRDC grant and contribution administration policy;
- more effective communication of policy interpretation and guidelines;
- extensive training; and
- the creation of a national grant and contribution web site.

The benefits of these additional measures are expected to be reflected in subsequent PTD reviews as grants and contributions' activities following this implementation are assessed.

2 OBJECTIVES

The principal objective of this report is to assess the extent to which HRDC has strengthened its administration of grants and contributions as of April 30, 2000. The 1999 Internal Audit Bureau (IAB) audit results serve as a baseline for measuring this progress.

3 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

All PTD assessments are based on the review of a statistically valid random sample of files drawn from all HRDC grant and contribution programs. These include Labour Market, Learning and Literacy, Social Development, Aboriginal Relations, Youth, Human Resources Partnerships, Official Languages for Minority Groups, and Labour. Provincially managed programs, individual income support payments, individual skill development agreements and Summer Career Placement files are not included in the review samples.

The first PTD quarterly progress report was released in August 2000. It reviewed a random sample of 142 files drawn from a population of 1,534 grant and contribution agreements with start dates between February 1, 2000 and March 31, 2000. While the first report provided statistically valid results at the national level for the majority of activities in the project life cycle, it could not provide statistically valid results for some activities. At that time, most files reviewed were still in the early stages of the project life cycle.

This second PTD quarterly progress report provides an assessment of a random sample of 274 files (covering both national and program level sampling requirements) drawn from a population of 2,460 grant and contribution agreements with a start date between February 1, 2000 and April 30, 2000. Files selected for this report have been active for a longer period of time than those selected for the first review. The report is therefore able to assess the administration of programs covering the majority of activities in the project life cycle.

In addition to providing statistically valid results at the national level, the report provides equivalent results at the program level for the six program areas reviewed (Labour Market, Youth, Learning and Literacy, Human Resource Partnerships, Labour, and Official Languages for Minority Groups) with the exception of Aboriginal Relations Office (ARO). Statistically valid results are not yet available for ARO projects because most existing ARO agreements cover five-year agreements and began before the start-date parameters of the Performance Tracking population.

The file review was performed using a detailed assessment questionnaire which covered all aspects of the business process related to the project life cycle (i.e., application, assessment, recommendation and approval, contracting, payments, monitoring, follow-up and evaluation, compliance with terms and conditions, as well as general administration). In addition, PTD completed financial verification of claims provided by sponsors covering 84 files selected on a random basis. Reviewers used detailed guidelines to assist in completing the file reviews and the financial verification.

To conduct financial verifications, the PTD requested that supporting financial documentation (general ledger printouts, payroll printouts, invoices and cancelled cheques) be provided by facsimile from sponsors where few expenditures were involved, and on-site visits were conducted on the remainder.

For additional quality control, an independent group within PTD did a second complete review of PTD results. This group included professional resources provided under agreement with Consulting and Audit Canada. Following the quality control assessment, file observations, and recommendations were sent to the appropriate HRDC location for validation and preparation of a management response. Management responses and follow-up action plans were incorporated into the final summary of results.

The Auditor General (AG) also reviewed and approved the PTD approach and sampling methodology. More specifically, the AG reported in its October 1999 report Chapter 11, page 11-32, *"The performance tracking system the Department has developed to monitor progress is an innovative approach to on-going performance measurement. If applied systematically, it should give management a good measure of the progress being made."*

The PTD methodology and sampling techniques used enable the results to be extrapolated to the HRDC grant and contribution population as a whole. In order to extrapolate results for each compliance related question, there must be a sufficient number of responses to questions assessed. PTD national results are based on a confidence interval of 90% (+ or – 5%, n=65 responses) or 95% (+ or – 2.5%, n=90 responses) with a 10% sampling error. At the program level, the sample size estimates have been adjusted according to program population size.

This report provides file review results related to 78 compliance questions. In 54 of the compliance areas reported, the compliance rate results can be extrapolated to the full population with a 90 to 95% degree of confidence. In the remaining 24 cases, the compliance rate results can only be presented for information purposes. These results provide information on the particular files reviewed but cannot be extrapolated with a high degree of confidence due to the low number of responses applicable to these questions at this time. Furthermore, since only 46 of the files reviewed covered completed projects, the results in the area of "follow-up and evaluation" cannot be considered statistically significant. As the results of subsequent reviews are reported, the extrapolation of compliance rates for this activity of the project life cycle will be possible.

To analyze and report results, the PTD used its database to consolidate file review results at the national level by business process and by question/criteria assessed. In addition, comparable compliance results from the 1999 IAB audit have been added to the PTD database in order to measure and track progress related to the ongoing administration of HRDC grant and contribution programs (refer to Annex A and B). This report also includes an analysis of results related to financial verifications completed (refer to Annex C) as well as an analysis at the program directorate level (refer to Annex D).

4 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The Second Quarterly PTD Report confirms that there continues to be significant, measurable improvements in the overall program management and administration of grants and contributions since the 1999 IAB audit. These findings are consistent with the positive trends found in the First Quarterly PTD Report.

4.1 FILE REVIEW CONCLUSIONS

The review performed by the PTD clearly indicates:

- sustained improvement in the management and administration of grant and contribution programs;
- a high level of compliance to departmental and Treasury Board policies and procedures;
- a compliance rate of 90% or above for 44 of 54 compliance questions assessed that are statistically valid results at the national level; and
- an increased level of financial and program documentation in support of the application, contracting, and payment processes.

Although there is a high level of compliance with grant and contribution standards and requirements, 10 of 54 compliance questions assessed were below the 90% compliance rate. Specific areas for further improvement have been identified:

- adherence to the requirement to input commitments in the HRDC accounting system prior to the signing of agreements;
- more complete file documentation related to the assessment performed regarding the project costs proposed by applicants/sponsors;
- more thorough completion of the schedules and basis of payments in the agreement; and
- guidelines that clarify the nature and scope of activities that meet program terms and conditions.

It should be noted that since April 30, 2000, HRDC has taken a number of specific measures and initiatives to address these weaknesses since April 30, 2000. The impact of these additional activities is not reflected in this current report, but is expected to be apparent in the findings of future PTD assessments.

4.2 FINANCIAL SUMMARY

As previously mentioned, 84 files were selected for PTD financial verifications with a total amount reviewed of $2,175,765. Results include:

- Satisfactory financial documentation which supported the claims.
- In 20 of the 84 financial verifications completed, PTD identified adjustments of $12,161 (0.56% of total contract value). The claim adjustments were specifically attributable to expenditures that occurred either before or after the contracting period stipulated in the agreement, inappropriate reimbursement of GST and other expenditures not adequately supported.
- In an additional 19 cases, further follow-up has been required by HRCCs to clarify allowable expenses. The total value of the expenses requiring follow-up is $98,653.
- Internal controls were considered adequate with the exception of one file where appropriate corrective action has been initiated.

5 NEXT STEPS

In accordance with its mandate, the PTD will provide quarterly reports summarizing the outcomes of on-going file reviews and financial verifications of sponsors. The PTD, in its next progress update will report assessment results on a new sample of files that are statistically significant at the national and regional levels.

ANNEX A - NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd Quarterly Progress Results 219 FILES	1999 IAB Audit Results 459 FILES
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	216	2	1	219	99.1%	85.2%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	210	6	3	219	97.2%	N/A
Includes objectives and activities	215	1	3	219	99.5%	75%
Includes a cost estimate	209	2	8	219	99.1%	89%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	212	4	3	219	98.1%	89%
ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	191	28	0	219	87.2%	31.8%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	160	55	4	219	74.4%	N/A
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	204	15	0	219	93.2%	2.6%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	215	4	0	219	98.2%	29.6%
RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	209	10	0	219	95.4%	38.0%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	216	3	0	219	98.6%	79.2%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	184	14	21	219	92.9%	N/A
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	200	0	19	219	100.0%	96.4%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	124	13	82	219	90.5%	N/A
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	170	10	39	219	94.4%	N/A
Expected results are described clearly	191	9	19	219	95.5%	N/A
Services and/or activities are described clearly	198	2	19	219	99.0%	N/A
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	177	23	19	219	88.5%	83.7%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	147	49	23	219	75.0%	N/A
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	192	2	25	219	99.0%	95.7%

The confidence interval is 95% for all questions/criteria assessed.
Detailed results are in Annex B

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd Quarterly Progress Results 219 FILES	1999 IAB Audit Results 459 FILES
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING (cont'd)						
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	195	5	19	219	97.5%	N/A
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	192	2	25	219	99.0%	N/A
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	190	9	20	219	95.5%	91.9%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	175	24	20	219	87.9%	N/A
Duration of agreement is stated	199	1	19	219	99.5%	N/A
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	199	20	219	100.0%	N/A
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	138	7	74	219	95.2%	N/A
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	196	1	22	219	99.5%	N/A
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	168	32	19	219	84.0%	N/A
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	134	61	24	219	68.7%	N/A
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	198	2	19	219	99.0%	86.6%
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	160	4	55	219	97.6%	N/A
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	131	3	85	219	97.8%	N/A
Claim periods overlap	1	109	109	219	99.1%	N/A
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	150	9	60	219	94.3%	N/A
Math is correct on all claim forms	158	2	59	219	98.8%	92.6%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	158	2	59	219	98.8%	N/A
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	193	3	23	219	98.5%	70.9%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	196	0	23	219	100.0%	N/A
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	177	3	39	219	98.3%	N/A
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	104	4	111	219	96.3%	N/A
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	105	3	111	219	97.2%	71.3%

The confidence interval is 95% for all questions/criteria assessed.
Details results are in Annex B

ANNEX A – NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS – DETAILED RESULTS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd Quarterly Progress Results 219 FILES	1999 IAB Audit Results 459 FILES
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	175	24	20	219	87.9%	N/A
Monitoring has been done according to plan	117	14	88	219	89.3%	N/A
Monitoring report(s) on file	115	3	101	219	97.5%	44%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	99	3	117	219	97.1%	23.4%

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	206	13	0	219	94.1%	N/A

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	215	4	0	219	98.2%	N/A
Participants meet program eligibility criteria	107	1	111	219	99.1%	N/A
Participant data is transmitted to HRCC and input to NESS	88	10	121	219	89.8%	N/A
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	1	218	0	219	99.5%	N/A
There are risks related to contravention of *Public Service Employment Act*	0	219	0	219	100.0%	N/A
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	7	212	0	219	96.8%	N/A
There are risks related to liability and public perception	1	218	0	219	99.5%	N/A

The confidence interval is 95% of all questions/criteria assessed.
Details results are in Annex B

ANNEX A – NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS – DETAILED RESULTS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2^nd^ Quarterly Progress Results 219 FILES	1999 IAB Audit Results 459 FILES
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
OTHER PTD RESULTS	***NOTE**: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*					
ASSESSMENT						
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	40	16	163	219	N/A	N/A
MP notification on file, if required by program	49	5	165	219	N/A	N/A
MP concurrence on file, if mandatory	32	3	184	219	N/A	57.1%
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	19	0	200	219	N/A	N/A
CONTRACTING						
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	14	3	202	219	N/A	N/A
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	18	5	196	219	N/A	N/A
Reason for amendment is clear	46	0	173	219	N/A	61.9%
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	17	0	202	219	N/A	N/A
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	5	9	205	219	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	14	5	200	219	N/A	N/A
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	37	2	180	219	N/A	N/A
PAYMENTS						
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	6	2	211	219	N/A	N/A
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	39	0	180	219	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended as required	24	16	179	219	N/A	N/A
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	47	0	172	219	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Financial visits documentation is thorough and accurate	45	5	169	219	N/A	N/A
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	12	5	202	219	N/A	N/A
Follow-up issues outlined	26	1	192	219	N/A	N/A
Follow-up initiated or completed	21	1	197	219	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	16	0	203	219	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	4	1	214	219	N/A	N/A
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	41	1	177	219	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable and recovery procedures initiated	3	2	214	219	N/A	N/A
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	42	3	174	219	N/A	N/A

ANNEX B - NATIONAL ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS - DETAILED RESULTS

APPLICATION

In the application phase, applicants are required to submit a detailed proposal and/or a standard application form to HRDC that describes the project they want to undertake.
A completed application or proposal should contain a description of objectives to be achieved, the activities, cost estimates, and an explanation of expected results.

For the purpose of this review, an acceptable application could have been in the form of an official application form, a proposal. a letter, or other documents.

The following table summarizes the results of the review of administration relating to the application phase:

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
APPLICATION	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
Application for funding from sponsor on file	216	2	1	219	99.1%	85.2%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	210	6	3	219	97.2%	N/A
Includes objectives and activities	215	1	3	219	99.5%	75.0%
Includes a cost estimate	209	2	8	219	99.1%	89.0%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	212	4	3	219	98.1%	89.0%

Application for funding from sponsor on file

- In the 216 files reviewed, an application for funding from sponsor was on file.
- Two (2) files did not contain an application. This issue had already been identified by the HRCC prior to the PTD review and corrective action was implemented.
- In the remaining file, the sponsor was not required to submit an application. Under program terms and conditions, Regional Bilateral Agreements and the Aboriginal Human Resources Development Strategy are the two instruments commonly used for funding Aboriginal communities.

Application was signed by representative of submitting organization

- In the 210 files reviewed, a representative of the submitting organization had signed the application.
- In the 6 other files reviewed, a representative of the submitting organization did not sign the application. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- As previously explained, the remaining 3 files did not contain an application.

Includes objectives and activities

- In the 215 files reviewed, the application included a description of the objectives and activities.
- In the case of the one application that did not include a description of objectives and activities, the HRCC has indicated that corrective measures have been implemented.
- As previously explained, the remaining 3 files did not contain an application.

Includes a cost estimate

- In the 209 files reviewed, the application included a cost estimate.
- In 2 of the remaining files, the application on file did not include a cost estimate. In one instance, the sponsor did not provide a detailed cost estimate at the application phase, but the HRCC had already identified and corrected this issue as a result of their internal file review process. A cost estimate was then added to the file. In the other instance, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- In the remaining 8 files, 3 files did not contain an application, as previously explained. The remaining 5 files reviewed were Job Creation Partnership projects with no contribution to the sponsor's overhead. Consequently, no cost estimate was required.

Includes explanation of results to be achieved

- In the 212 files reviewed, the application included an explanation of results to be achieved.
- In the 4 other files reviewed, the application did not contain a description of results to be achieved. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- As previously explained, the remaining 3 files did not contain an application.

ASSESSMENT

The Assessment phase involves a careful, thorough review of applications/proposals to ensure that they support program objectives and meet local, regional, and national priorities. This phase is important to ensure that the proposal meets HRDC criteria, and is realistic and feasible. It allows the Project Officer to anticipate potential problems in a project and rectify them before the project starts.

Our review consisted of assessing whether or not the files reviewed contained evidence that the project officers considered program criteria in their assessment; that sponsors were checked for outstanding debt to HRDC in the Departmental Accounts Receivable System (DARS) prior to project approval; that there was formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources; that the proposal had all required concurrence; and that environmental assessment was addressed adequately on file.

The following table summarizes the results of the review of assessment:

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
ASSESSMENT	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	191	28	0	219	87.2%	31.8%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	160	55	4	219	74.4%	N/A
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	204	15	0	219	93.2%	2.6%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	215	4	0	219	98.2%	29.6%

The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives

- In the 191 files reviewed, the written assessment demonstrated that the project supported program objectives.
- Of the 28 remaining files, 8 files lacked a written assessment. The other 20 files contained assessment information that did not specifically address how the project supported program objectives. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.

Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered

- The 160 files reviewed included assessment documentation indicating that proposed costs were assessed.
- In 55 files, the documentation did not indicate that proposed costs were assessed. In 47 files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC. In 8 files, the HRCC are responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- The remaining 4 files relate to Job Creation Partnership projects which did not require costs to be identified in the proposal.

Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC

- In the 204 files reviewed, sponsors were checked for outstanding debt to HRDC. In one case, the DARS check was completed after the agreement was signed.
- Of the remaining 15 files, in 6 files the checklist indicated that the DARS check was done, but it was not dated or initialled. The 9 remaining files did not contain any reference to indicate that a check was done. PTD verification confirmed that no overpayment existed for these 15 files. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.

Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file

- In 215 files, the environmental assessment was adequately addressed.
- Of the 4 remaining files, 3 did not contain an environmental assessment pre-screening as required. In the last instance, the action recommended, as part of the environmental assessment was not reflected in the agreement. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.

RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVAL

After assessment, a proposal may be recommended for funding. The person who has assessed the proposal must make this recommendation, clearly stating the rationale for the funding. A person with the appropriate level of approval authority must sign the funding approval.

The following table summarizes the results of the review of the recommendation and approval phase:

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	**ANSWERS**				**2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES**	**1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES**
RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**	**TOTAL**	**Compliance Level**	**Compliance Level**
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	209	10	0	219	95.4%	38.0%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	216	3	0	219	98.6%	79.2%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	184	14	21	219	92.9%	N/A

Rationale/analysis for funding on file

- 209 files reviewed included a rationale/analysis for funding the project.
- The 10 remaining files did not contain a rationale/analysis for funding the project. Of these 10, two had already been identified by the HRCC prior to the PTD review. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.

Approval signed with correct delegation of authority

- The 216 files reviewed contained an approval signed with the correct delegation of authority.
- In the 3 remaining files, the projects were approved without the proper delegated authority, and the person who signed the agreement did not have the signing authority to approve the project. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.

Approval signed on or prior to project start date

- 184 files had the required approval signed on or prior to project start date.
- In 14 other files, the approval was signed after the project start date. In 13 of these files, the agreement itself was also signed after the project start date. In the remaining file, the agreement was signed prior to the project start date, however, the person who signed the agreement did not have the delegated authority to approve the project. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- As for the 21 N/A answers, 19 files were grants where this particular assessment requirement is not applicable because grants are unconditional transfer payments. In the remaining 2 files, there were no written approvals on file and the issue has already been raised under a previous question.

CONTRACTING

The contracting phase involves the preparation and signing of an agreement between HRDC and a sponsor. The agreement clarifies the roles, responsibilities, and the expectations of both parties. It also sets out measurable objectives and establishes the basis on which the officer will monitor and evaluate the project. The officer can only monitor and evaluate what is set out in the contract. Therefore, it is essential that all agreements be complete and contain all required terms and conditions.

The following table summarizes the results of the performance tracking review of the contracting phase.

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
CONTRACTING	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
Agreement is on file	200	0	19	219	100.0%	96.4%
Objectives include measurable timelines/ milestones	124	13	82	219	90.5%	N/A
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	170	10	39	219	94.4%	N/A
Expected results are described clearly	191	9	19	219	95.5%	N/A
Services and/or activities are described clearly	198	2	19	219	99.0%	N/A
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	177	23	19	219	88.5%	83.7%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	147	49	23	219	75.0%	N/A
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	192	2	25	219	99.0%	95.7%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	195	5	19	219	97.5%	N/A
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	192	2	25	219	99.0%	N/A
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	190	9	20	219	95.5%	91.9%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	175	24	20	219	87.9%	N/A
Duration of agreement is stated	199	1	19	219	99.5%	N/A
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	199	20	219	100.0%	N/A
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor, and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	138	7	74	219	95.2%	N/A
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	196	1	22	219	99.5%	N/A
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	168	32	19	219	84.0%	N/A
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	134	61	24	219	68.7%	N/A
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	198	2	19	219	99.0%	86.6%

Agreement is on file

- Of the 200 files reviewed, all contained a copy of the signed agreement.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones

- Of the 124 agreements reviewed, all described objectives that included measurable timelines and/or milestones.
- Of the 13 agreements reviewed, all described objectives that did not include measurable timelines/milestones for the achievement of project outcomes. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- Of the remaining 82 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement, and the other 63 files related to projects that did not require the agreement to include measurable timelines/milestones.

Objectives include measurable statement of quantity

- Of the 170 agreements reviewed, all described objectives that included a measurable statement of quantity.
- In another 10 agreements, there was not a quantitative statement in the objectives that the Project Officer could verify through monitoring. In 9 files, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC. In the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- Of the remaining 39 files reviewed, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement. For the remaining 20 files, the nature of the project did not require the agreement to include measurable statement of quantity.

Expected results are described clearly

- In the 191 agreements reviewed, expected results were described clearly.
- In another 9 agreements, the expected results were not described clearly enough to allow for meaningful monitoring by the Project Officer. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Services and/or activities are described clearly

- The 198 agreements reviewed clearly described services and/or activities.
- In another 2 agreements, the services and/or activities were not described clearly enough to allow for meaningful monitoring by the Project Officer. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Nature of authorized expenses is clear

- In the 177 files reviewed, the nature of authorized expenses was clearly described.
- In 23 agreements, none clearly outlined the nature of authorized expenses. In 22 cases, authorized expenses, such as overhead costs, were too broad to allow an assessment of specific project costs. In the remaining case there was no schedule B attached to the agreement. In 22 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement

- In the 147 agreements reviewed, the schedule and basis of payment were clearly outlined.
- In another 49 agreements, unnecessary payment clauses were not deleted as required. In these situations, the agreement did not clearly identify the schedule and basis of payment negotiated. In 46 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 3 files, the HRCCs is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- Of the remaining 23 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement and the remaining 4 files were Job Creation Partnership projects not involving payments to the sponsor.

Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed

- In 192 of the agreements reviewed, there was a clause allowing for HRDC to audit costs claimed.
- In 2 files, the agreements reviewed did not contain the audit clause. For both of these files, this issue had already been raised by the HRCC prior to the PTD review and the region has amended the contract template accordingly. For one of these files, PTD recommended that the agreement be amended to include an audit clause. The HRCC is responding to the PTD recommendation. As for the other file no amendment is required since the agreement has been completed.
- Of the remaining 25 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement, 5 files were Job Creation Partnership projects not involving payments to the sponsor, and 1 file was for an endowment fund.

Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause

- The 195 files reviewed included appropriate provisions for termination with and without cause.
- In the 5 remaining files, 3 files had no provision to terminate the agreement without cause and the remaining 2 files did not include the provision to terminate the agreement with cause. In these 2 files, this issue had already been raised by the HRCC prior to the PTD review and the region has amended the contract template accordingly. For one of these files, PTD recommended that the agreement be amended to include a termination with cause clause. The HRCC is responding to the PTD recommendation. As for the other file, no amendment is required since the agreement has been completed. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses

- Of the 192 files reviewed which contained agreements, the agreement included a clause stating the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses.
- In 2 files, the agreements reviewed did not contain the clause requiring the recipient to repay overpayment. For both of these files, this issue had already been raised by the HRCC prior to the PTD review and the region has amended the contract template accordingly. For one of these files, PTD recommended that the agreement be amended to include the clause requiring the recipient to repay overpayment. The HRCC is responding to the PTD recommendation. As for the other file, no amendment is required since the agreement has been completed.
- Of the remaining 25 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement, 5 files were Job Creation Partnership projects not involving payments to the sponsor, and 1 file was for an endowment fund.

Text of the agreement matches the program utilized

- In the 190 files reviewed, the text of the agreement matched the program utilized.
- In another 9 files reviewed, the agreement did not match the program utilized. In two of these instances, the HRCC had already identified this issue prior to the PTD review. However, these situations did not affect the contractual obligation of both parties.
- Of the remaining 20 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement. As for the remaining file, an observation and recommendation has already been raised under another question.

All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared

- In 175 of the files reviewed, all necessary schedules were included and properly prepared.
- In 24 files reviewed, all necessary schedules were not included and properly prepared. In 22 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 2 files, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 20 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement or schedules. In one case, an observation and recommendation has already been raised under another question.

Duration of agreement is stated

- In 199 of the files reviewed, the duration of the agreement was stated.
- In one case, the duration of the agreement was not stated. Corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Agreement value exceeds approval amount

- In 199 of the files reviewed, the agreement value did not exceed the approved amount.
- As for the remaining 20 files, 19 were for grant programs and did not require an agreement. In one file, there was no approval on file and the issue was already raised in a previous question.

Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor, and in agreement with HRDC contracted total

- 138 of the files reviewed contained a cashflow forecast that was signed by the sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total.
- In 7 other files reviewed, the cashflow forecast was on file, however, it had not been properly completed. In 4 of these 7 cases, the sponsor had not signed the cashflow forecast. In 1 case, the cashflow forecast had not been completed at the time the agreement was prepared. In 1 case, the cashflow forecast showed a variance of $350 with the contracted amount. In another case, the cashflow forecast exceeded the amount of the agreement by approximately $95,000. HRCC's have been notified to make appropriate adjustments to forecasted cashflows.
- As for the remaining 74 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement, and there was no requirement for a cashflow forecast to be on file for the other 55 files.

Agreement signed on or after project approval date

- 196 of the files reviewed contained an agreement that was signed on/or after the project approval date.
- In one file, the agreement was signed prior to the project approval date and the person who signed the agreement did not have the delegated authority to sign the approval. Corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 22 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement; in 3 cases, there was no approval on file, and the issue has already been raised under a previous question.

Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date

- In 168 of the files reviewed, the agreement was signed on/or prior to agreement start date.
- In 32 other files reviewed, the agreement was signed after the agreement start date. In 5 of these 32 files, this issue had already been identified by the HRCC prior to the PTD review. In 31 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement

- 134 of the files reviewed had a financial commitment prior to the HRDC signing agreement.
- In another 61 files, the financial commitment was completed after the agreement signature date. In 3 of these files, the HRCC had already identified this issue prior to the PTD review. In 56 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 5 files, the HRCC are responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
    - ➢ 1 to 15 days late: 44 files;
    - ➢ 16 to 30 days late: 12 files;
    - ➢ 31 to 45 days late: 4 files; and
    - ➢ 46 and up: 1 file
- As for the remaining 24 files, 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement, and 5 files did not involve direct payment to the sponsor (Job Creation Partnership projects).

Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority

- 198 agreements reviewed were signed in all required places by an HRDC official with the appropriate delegated authority at the agreement level.
- In another file, the signing officer did not have the appropriate delegated signing authority at the agreement level. The agreement amount was for $1M and the signing officer only had delegated signing authority for $100,000. No further action is required as the Assistant Deputy Minister has since countersigned the agreement.
- In the remaining file, the person who approved and signed the agreement had the appropriate delegated authority but omitted to sign Schedule "A" of the agreement. Corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC.
- In 2 files, the projects were recommended and approved by HRDC officials with the appropriate delegated authority.
- The remaining 19 files were for grant programs and did not require an agreement.

PAYMENTS

A contribution payment can be in the form of a progress payment or an advance. A progress payment consists of reimbursing allowable expenses incurred by the sponsor and claimed for a period ranging from 30 days to 90 days.

Advances consist of payments for anticipated expenses for a specific period, usually monthly or quarterly. Sponsors submit payment claims at the end of each period to account for the advances received. The terms and conditions of each agreement specify any requirements for the sponsor to submit an activity report for the same period. It is the responsibility of sponsors to keep adequate financial documentation in support of their expenses.

The following table summarizes the results of the review of payments.

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
PAYMENTS	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
All required claim forms are on file	160	4	55	219	97.6%	N/A
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	131	3	85	219	97.8%	N/A
Claims periods overlap	1	109	109	219	99.1%	N/A
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	150	9	60	219	94.3%	N/A
Math is correct on all claim forms	158	2	59	219	98.8%	92.6%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	158	2	59	219	98.8%	N/A
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	193	3	23	219	98.5%	70.9%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	196	0	23	219	100.0%	N/A
As the per 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	177	3	39	219	98.3%	N/A
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	104	4	111	219	96.3%	N/A
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	105	3	111	219	97.2%	71.3%

All required claim forms are on file

- 160 of the files reviewed contained the required claim forms from the sponsors.
- In 4 other files reviewed, the claim was due, but had not yet been submitted to the HRCC by the sponsor as required by the agreement. In 3 cases, the HRCC has indicated receiving the required claim forms and in the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 55 files, there was no requirement for a claim to be on file.

Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement

- 131 files reviewed, which required supporting documentation, contained the required documentation.
- In 3 other files reviewed, claims did not contain the activity report as required by the agreement. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 85 files, in 55 cases there was no claim on file, and in 30 cases there was not a requirement, as per the agreement, to have an activity report or supporting documentation to accompany the claim.

Claim periods overlap

- In 109 of the files reviewed, the periods claimed did not overlap.
- Only 1 file contained claims with overlapping periods, but did not result in duplicate expenditures paid.
- As for the remaining 109 files, this question was not applicable, as there were less than two claims on file.

Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement

- 150 files contained claims that matched the expense categories allowed in the agreement.
- In 9 other files reviewed, some of the amounts claimed by the sponsor, and paid by HRDC, did not match the expense categories allowed in the agreement, as they related to items that were not described as allowable expenses. PTD recommended taking appropriate action at the HRCC level. In 6 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 3 files, the HRCC are responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 60 files, in 55 files there was no requirement for a claim to be submitted at the time the PTD file review was carried out, and the 5 other files were already reported under previous question.

Math is correct on claim forms

- In 158 claims involving expenses, the math calculation on claim forms was correct.
- In 2 other files reviewed, in one instance the error in calculation was an underpayment to the sponsor in the amount of $2, in the other, the GST in the amount of $203 was reimbursed to the sponsor, who also claimed this amount from Canada Customs and Revenue Agency. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented. In addition, follow-up has been initiated with the HRCC to determine whether the amount has been reimbursed.
- As for the remaining 59 files, in 55 files there was no requirement for a claim to be submitted at the time the PTD file review was carried out, and in the 4 other files, the issue has already been raised under a previous question.

Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor

- In 158 of the files reviewed, the sponsors correctly signed the claim forms.
- In 2 other files reviewed, one did not contain documentation to confirm the authority of the person that signed the claim, in the other, the claim form was signed and dated prior to the end date of the period covered by the claim. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 59 files, in 55 files there was no requirement for a claim to be submitted at the time the PTD file review was carried out, and in the other 4 files, the issue has already been raised under a previous question.

Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature

- In 193 of the files reviewed, that included an advance or payment claim, payments were authorized with the correct delegation of authority under Section 34 of the *Financial Administration Act* (FAA).
- In 3 other files reviewed, 1 claim was not countersigned as required; in another file, 1 claim was not signed by the person with the correct delegation of authority under Section 34 of the FAA (the local office prior to PTD review had already identified this issue and implemented corrective action for future claims); and in 1 other file, there was no Section 34 signature on the claim. In 1 file, corrective measures have been implemented by the HRCC. In 2 files, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 23 files, in 4 files there was no claims on file as required by the agreement and the remaining 19 other files had no claim form or advance on file.

At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition

- All of the 196 files reviewed, which included an advance or payment claim, met the requirement for the involvement of at least two people in the payment requisition process.
- As for the remaining 23 files, in 4 files, the issue has already been raised under a previous question; in 5 files these were Job Creation Partnership projects which did not require a claim to be submitted by the sponsor; and in the remaining 14 files, claim forms were not submitted by the sponsor.

As per 5-point ADM directive (January 20, 2000), file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued

- In 177 of the files reviewed and for which a certification was required, there was compliance with the January 20, 2000 5-point ADM directive.
- In 3 other files reviewed, there was no documentation on file indicating that the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued as per the 5-point ADM directive issued January 20, 2000. In these 3 cases, no recommendations were raised since this requirement has since been lifted.
- As for the remaining 39 files, in 23 files there was no claim form or advance on file, and as for the remaining 16 files there was no requirement for the certification to be on file as the requirement had been lifted.

If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance

- In all 104 files, in which advances had been issued, the sponsor was eligible for an initial advance.
- In 4 files, the sponsor was not eligible for the advance issued, as these cases did not take into account previous outstanding advances as per HRDC policy on issuance of advances. In 4 files, the HRCC are responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 111 files, no advance payments were issued.

Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits

- In 105 of the files, in which advances had been issued, the advances were within Treasury Board limits.
- In 3 files, the advance issued exceeded Treasury Board Limits. In one, the advance issued to the sponsor exceeded the 75% limit outlined in the Treasury Board policy advances by $1,340. In two cases, the sponsor was provided a quarterly advance instead of a monthly, as per Treasury Board policy for agreements in excess of $500,000. In 3 files, the HRCC are responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 111 files, no advances were issued to the sponsor.

MONITORING

Monitoring is the mechanism used by officers to ensure compliance with agreements. It involves visiting sponsors to ensure they are meeting obligations and conducting activities in accordance with their agreements. It provides the opportunity to work with the sponsor and participants to resolve problems and to improve activities, if necessary, to achieve the best possible results. It is also important in order to verify that all expenses claimed are allowable under the contractual agreement and are supported by acceptable supporting documentation.

Effective project management and monitoring involves completing a monitoring risk assessment at project start-up.

The following table summarizes the results of the review of the monitoring phase.

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
MONITORING	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	175	24	20	219	87.9%	N/A
Monitoring has been done according to plan	117	14	88	219	89.3%	N/A
Monitoring report(s) on file	115	3	101	219	97.5%	44.0%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	99	3	117	219	97.1%	23.4%

A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file

- 175 files contained a risk assessment or monitoring plan on file that was completed at agreement start date.
- In 24 other files reviewed, in 7 instances there was no risk assessment or monitoring plan on file. However, in one of these instances, monitoring reports were on file. In 9 instances, the risk assessment or monitoring plan was not dated. Consequently, we could not determine whether the risk assessment or monitoring plan was completed at the start of the agreement. In 2 instances, the risk assessment and monitoring plan did not identify specific dates for the monitoring visits to take place. In 6 instances, the risk assessment or monitoring plan was completed more than one month after the agreement start date. In 22 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 2 files, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 20 files, 19 files were for grant programs and 1 file was for the creation of an endowment fund. These 20 cases are not subject to this monitoring requirement.

Monitoring has been done according to plan

- 117 files indicated that monitoring was completed according to plan.
- In 14 other files reviewed, the scheduled visits were not completed in the time frame identified in the monitoring plan. In 13 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 88 files, 19 files were for grant programs, and 1 file was for the creation of an endowment fund. These 20 cases are not subject to this monitoring requirement. As for the remaining 68 files, monitoring visits had not yet occurred as per the monitoring plan.

Monitoring reports on file

- 115 of the files reviewed contained a monitoring report as required. In one instance, there was no risk assessment or monitoring plan on file but monitoring reports were on file.
- In 3 other files, there was information on file indicating that a monitor had occurred, however, no monitoring reports were on file. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 101 files, 19 files were for grant programs, and 1 file was for the creation of an endowment fund. These 20 cases are not subject to this monitoring requirement. In 14 other files reviewed, the scheduled visits were not completed in the time frame identified in the monitoring plan. As for the remaining 67 files, monitoring visits had not yet occurred as per the monitoring plan.

Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement

- In 99 of the files reviewed, project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement.
- In the 3 remaining files, monitoring reports were on file, however, there was no documentation on whether the project activities were monitored for compliance with the agreement. In all files, corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 117 files, 19 files were for grant programs, and 1 file was for the creation of an endowment fund. These 20 cases are not subject to this monitoring requirement. In 16 other files reviewed, the monitoring reports on file were for initial visits or financial visits. In these cases, the project activities were not monitored. In 3 files, there was no monitoring report on file. In 64 files, monitoring visits had not yet occurred as per the monitoring plan. In the remaining 14 files reviewed, the scheduled visits were not completed in the timeframe identified in the monitoring plan.

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS AND CONDITIONS

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	**ANSWERS**				**2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES**	**1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES**
COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**	**TOTAL**	**Compliance Level**	**Compliance Level**
Activities meet program terms and conditions	206	13	0	219	94.1%	N/A

Activities meet program terms and conditions

- 206 files were compliant with Program Terms and Conditions.
- In the 13 remaining files, the project activities were reviewed and were not in compliance with all aspects of the programs' terms and conditions. Four (4) files were involved in the purchase of training or support to training initiatives; 2 files were being reimbursed on a flat fee for service basis only; and in 1 of these instances services were purchased for the HRCC; 1 file was for the purchase of work stations for a call centre; and at least 2 files offered direct counselling service and therefore would have been appropriate under Employment Assistance Service, but not Local Labour Market Partnerships. The remaining 4 files were related to program criteria interpretation. HRCCs have all been informed and are implementing appropriate corrective measures.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

QUESTION/CRITERIA ASSESSMENT	ANSWERS				2nd Quarterly Report RESULTS 219 FILES	1999 IAB AUDIT RESULTS 459 FILES
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	YES	NO	N/A	TOTAL	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
As per the February 11th 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	215	4	0	219	98.2%	N/A
Participants meet program eligibility criteria	107	1	111	219	99.1%	N/A
Participant data is transmitted to HRCC and input to NESS	88	10	121	219	89.8%	N/A
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	1	218	0	219	99.5%	N/A
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	219	0	219	100.0%	N/A
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	7	212	0	219	96.8%	N/A
There are risks related to liability and public perception	1	218	0	219	99.5%	N/A

As per the February 11th 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file

- 215 of the files reviewed contained a project life cycle file review checklist.
- As for the remaining 4 files, in three instances there was no life cycle file review checklist completed on file. In one instance there was a checklist on file, however, it did not cover all the stages of the project life cycle. In 3 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In the remaining file, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.

Participants meet program eligibility criteria

- In 107 of the files reviewed, participants met all program eligibility criteria.
- In another file, there was no documentation on file to confirm that the participants met program eligibility criteria. Corrective measures have been implemented.
- As for the remaining 111 files, in 110 files there were no participants, and in the remaining file, PTD was unable to determine participant eligibility since the project had been delayed.

Participant data is transmitted to HRCC and input to NESS

- 88 files had the participant data transmitted to the HRCC and entered into the NESS system.
- In 10 other files, there was no documentation on file indicating that participant data was entered into NESS. PTD further confirmed that this data had not been entered into NESS. In 8 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 2 files, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.
- As for the remaining 121 files, there were no participant data involved.

HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem

- All 218 files indicated that there were no problems related to HRDC exercising inappropriate supervisory control, and employer/employee relationship.
- In the remaining file, the documentation on file demonstrated that there was a risk of the HRCC creating an employer/employee relationship. The HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.

There are risks related to contravention of the Public Service Employment Act

- All 219 files indicated that there were no risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*.

There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC

- Of the 212 files, all indicated that there were no risks related to improper use of contribution funds.
- In 7 files, PTD identified risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the projects are supplying goods or services to HRDC. In 5 files, corrective measures have been implemented. In 2 files, the HRCC is responding to the PTD observation and recommendation.

There are risks related to liability and public perception

- 218 files indicated that there were no risks related to liability and public perception.
- In one file, PTD identified that there were risks related to liability and public perception, as the coordinator is located on HRDC premises. Corrective measures have been implemented.

ANNEX C - FINANCIAL VERIFICATION

DETAILED RESULTS

The following tables provide more detailed results on the financial verification.

DATA		*FILES*	*%*
	Population of files statistically selected	219	100.0
	On-site audit files	47	56.0
	Desk audit files	37	44.0
TOTAL		84	38.6

RESULTS		*FILES*	*AMOUNT*	*%*
	Total amount reviewed	84	$2,175,765	100.0%

Identified Adjustments		*FILES*	*AMOUNT*	*%*
	Claimed prior or after activity period	6	$5,084	0.23
	Disallowed after comparing actual cost and fee for service	1	$4,517	0.21
	Claimed GST refundable	3	$313	0.01
	Schedule B expenditures categories exceeded	5	$1,588	0.07
	Expense claimed twice	1	$130	0.01
	Expenditures not properly supported	4	$529	0.03
TOTAL		20	$12,161	0.56%

Follow-up Required		*FILES*	*AMOUNT*
	Still under review - clarification required from HRCC	19	$98,653

FINANCIAL REVIEW CONCLUSIONS

- In all but one of the 47 on-site financial reviews conducted, reviewers felt confident in the level of financial control by the sponsoring organization. In one situation, it was clear that the staff person responsible for bookkeeping did not have the skills required for adequate control.
- The total amount of claimed expenditures reviewed by PTD was $2,175,765. Of the total reviewed, $12,161 (or 0.56%) of costs claimed and reimbursed by HRDC were deemed not allowable under the existing project Agreements. This amount is the result of inappropriate reimbursements on 16 projects as described below. Subsequent to the review, appropriate adjustments have been made or initiated by the respective HRCCs in all 16 cases.
- The major cause detected for inappropriate payments related to the timing of project expenditures in relation to agreement start and end dates. In the case of six files, although the expenditures in question were project related and appropriate according to the agreements, they were incurred either before the agreement start date, or after the agreement end date. The agreements in question were written to span the duration of project activities, rather than the duration of project-related expenditures. This approach to writing agreements accounted for $5,084 in inappropriate payments or 0.23% of the total amount reviewed. This issue has been brought to the attention of the NHQ Operational Policy Committee, and clarification regarding agreement funding periods will be distributed to program staff.
- In three situations, it was found that HRDC had been reimbursing the full amount of sponsor GST costs when the sponsor was also receiving a GST rebate. The total amount inappropriately reimbursed was $313 or 0.01% of the total amount reviewed. Adjustments have now been made by the responsible HRCCs in relation to all, except $7, of these expenditures. This issue has been brought to the attention of the NHQ Operational Policy Committee, and clarification regarding this subject will be distributed to program staff.
- In one situation, the review was unable to be concluded because the sponsor's claims had been based upon a fee rather than incurred costs. In this situation, a complete financial review has since been conducted by the HRCC, and $4,517 of the expenses claimed for this $211,175 agreement have been disallowed. An adjustment for this amount has been made to a subsequent claim form. This amount accounted for .2% of the total amount reviewed.
- Of the remaining situations, five sponsors exceeded the Schedule B amount specified for particular expenditure categories for an amount totalling $1,588, one sponsor inadvertently paid the same $130 bill twice and claimed the expense twice, and four sponsors had overclaimed for a total of $529. The reimbursement of inappropriate expenditures to these 10 sponsors accounts for $2,247 in payments, or 0.1% of the total amount reviewed. In all cases the responsible HRCC has been advised and adjustments will be made.
- An additional 19 cases were identified where further information is required on the financial documentation supplied by the sponsors in order to clarify allowable expenses. Once clarification is received from the HRCC for these cases, a determination of possible adjustments will be made. The total value of the expenses requiring follow-up is $98,653.

ANNEX D - PROGRAM ANALYSIS BY BUSINESS PROCESS

LABOUR MARKET

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	138	2	0	140	98.6%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	135	3	2	140	97.8%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	138	0	2	140	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	131	2	7	140	98.5%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	135	3	2	140	97.8%	98.1%

ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	118	22	0	140	84.3%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	109	27	4	140	80.1%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	128	12	0	140	91.4%	93.2%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	136	4	0	140	97.1%	98.2%

RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	133	7	0	140	95.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	138	2	0	140	98.6%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	128	11	1	140	92.1%	92.9%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

LABOUR MARKET

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	140	0	0	140	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	82	13	45	140	86.3%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	118	7	15	140	94.4%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	133	7	0	140	95.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	138	2	0	140	98.6%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	124	16	0	140	88.6%	88.5%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	102	34	4	140	75.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	133	2	5	140	98.5%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	136	4	0	140	97.1%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	133	2	5	140	98.5%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	138	1	1	140	99.3%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	122	17	1	140	87.8%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	140	0	0	140	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	140	0	140	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	97	5	38	140	95.1%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	137	1	2	140	99.3%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	122	18	0	140	87.1%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	91	44	5	140	67.4%	68.7%
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	139	1	0	140	99.3%	99.0%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

LABOUR MARKET

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	116	1	23	140	99.1%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	99	2	39	140	98.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	1	77	62	140	98.7%*	99.1%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	109	6	25	140	94.8%	94.3%
Math is correct on all claim forms	114	2	24	140	98.3%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	113	2	25	140	98.3%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	122	2	16	140	98.4%	98.5%
At least two people have initialed/signed/input/approved payment requisition	124	0	16	140	100.0%	100.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	106	2	32	140	98.1%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	74	4	62	140	94.9%*	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	78	0	62	140	100.0%*	97.2%

MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	123	17	0	140	87.9%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	75	12	53	140	86.2%*	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	71	2	67	140	97.3%*	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	61	2	77	140	96.8%*	97.1%

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	130	10	0	140	92.9%	94.1%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

LABOUR MARKET

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	138	2	0	140	98.6%	98.2%
Participants meet program eligibility criteria	87	0	53	140	100.0%*	99.1%
Participant data is transmitted to HRCC and input to NESS	75	7	58	140	91.5%*	89.8%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	1	139	0	140	99.3%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	140	0	140	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	5	135	0	140	96.4%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	1	139	0	140	99.3%	99.5%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

OTHER PTD RESULTS	***NOTE**: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*					
ASSESSMENT						
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	*32*	*9*	*99*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
MP notification on file, if required by program	*22*	*0*	*118*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
MP concurrence on file, if mandatory	*26*	*3*	*111*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	*13*	*0*	*127*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
CONTRACTING						
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	*9*	*1*	*130*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	*10*	*3*	*127*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Reason for amendment is clear	*37*	*0*	*103*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	*15*	*0*	*125*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	*4*	*8*	*128*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	*9*	*4*	*127*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	*30*	*2*	*108*	*140*	*N/A*	*N/A*

LABOUR MARKET

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
OTHER PTD RESULTS (cont'd) ***NOTE*: The following results are not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed**						
PAYMENTS						
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	3	1	136	140	N/A	N/A
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	28	0	112	140	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended as required	18	14	108	140	N/A	N/A
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	34	0	106	140	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Financial visits documentation is thorough and accurate	24	2	114	140	N/A	N/A
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	8	3	129	140	N/A	N/A
Follow-up issues outlined	19	1	120	140	N/A	N/A
Follow-up initiated or completed	15	1	124	140	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	9	0	131	140	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	3	1	136	140	N/A	N/A
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	19	1	120	140	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable and recovery procedures initiated	2	1	137	140	N/A	N/A
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	20	2	118	140	N/A	N/A

YOUTH

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	81	1	0	82	98.8%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	77	4	1	82	95.1%*	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	80	1	1	82	98.8%*	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	81	0	1	82	100.0%*	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	77	4	1	82	95.1%*	98.1%

ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	75	7	0	82	91.5%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	58	21	3	82	73.4%*	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	81	1	0	82	98.8%	93.2%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	82	0	0	82	100.0%	98.2%

RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/Analysis for funding on file	79	3	0	82	96.3%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	82	0	0	82	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	79	3	0	82	96.3%	92.9%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

YOUTH

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2^{nd} QPR **Program** Results	2^{nd} QPR **National** Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	82	0	0	82	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	48	1	33	82	98.0%*	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	73	5	4	82	93.6%*	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	79	3	0	82	96.3%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	82	0	0	82	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	74	8	0	82	90.2%	88.5%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	52	30	0	82	63.4%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	82	0	0	82	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	80	2	0	82	97.6%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	82	0	0	82	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	72	10	0	82	87.8%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	73	9	0	82	89.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	81	1	0	82	98.8%	99.5%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	82	0	82	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor, and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	48	3	31	82	94.1%*	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	82	0	0	82	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	66	16	0	82	80.5%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	61	21	0	82	74.4%	68.7%
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	82	0	0	82	100.0%	99.0%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%.

YOUTH

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	71	5	6	82	93.4%*	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	56	1	25	82	98.2%*	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	1	56	25	82	98.2%*	99.1%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	69	3	10	82	95.8%*	94.3%
Math is correct on all claim forms	72	0	10	82	100.0%*	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	73	0	9	82	100.0%*	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	75	1	6	82	98.7%*	98.5%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	76	0	6	82	100.0%*	100.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	72	1	9	82	98.6%*	98.3%
MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	75	7	0	82	91.5%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	64	4	14	82	94.1%*	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	64	2	16	82	97.0%*	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	58	1	23	82	98.3%*	97.1%
COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	78	4	0	82	95.1%	94.1%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%

YOUTH

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	79	3	0	82	96.3%	98.2%
Participants meet program eligibility criteria	45	1	36	82	97.8%*	99.1%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	82	0	82	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	82	0	82	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	2	80	0	82	97.6%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	82	0	82	100.0%	99.5%

Unless otherwise noted with an asterisk, the confidence interval is 95%

OTHER PTD RESULTS	*NOTE: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*					
ASSESSMENT						
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	9	9	64	82	N/A	N/A
MP notification on file, if required by program	33	8	41	82	N/A	N/A
MP concurrence on file, if mandatory	5	0	77	82	N/A	N/A
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	2	0	80	82	N/A	N/A
CONTRACTING						
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	6	2	74	82	N/A	N/A
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	8	2	72	82	N/A	N/A
Reason for amendment is clear	12	0	70	82	N/A	N/A
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	2	0	80	82	N/A	N/A
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	2	0	80	82	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	4	1	77	82	N/A	N/A
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	7	0	75	82	N/A	N/A

YOUTH

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
OTHER PTD RESULTS (cont'd) NOTE: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.						
PAYMENTS						
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	5	1	76	82	N/A	N/A
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	14	0	68	82	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended as required	6	2	74	82	N/A	N/A
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	32	0	50	82	N/A	N/A
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	32	1	49	82	N/A	N/A
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	14	0	68	82	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Financial visits documentation is thorough and accurate	35	4	43	82	N/A	N/A
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	6	2	74	82	N/A	N/A
Follow-up issues outlined	12	0	70	82	N/A	N/A
Follow-up initiated or completed	10	0	72	82	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	8	0	74	82	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	1	0	81	82	N/A	N/A
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	32	0	50	82	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable and recovery procedures initiated	1	1	80	82	N/A	N/A
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	32	1	49	82	N/A	N/A
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
Participant data is transmitted to HRCC and input to NESS	35	3	44	82	N/A	N/A

LEARNING & LITERACY

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	24	0	0	24	100.0%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	23	1	0	24	95.8%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	24	0	0	24	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	24	0	0	24	100.0%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	24	0	0	24	100.0%	98.1%
ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	24	0	0	24	100.0%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	5	19	0	24	20.8%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	23	1	0	24	95.8%	93.2%
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	4	0	20	24	100.0%	N/A
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	24	0	0	24	100.0%	98.2%
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	2	0	22	24	100.0%	100.0%
RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	24	0	0	24	100.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	24	0	0	24	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	92.9%

The Learning & Literacy sample consists of 19 grant files and 5 contribution files. As indicated in the table, not all questions applied to these two types of transfer payments.

For the 19 grant files reviewed, the confidence interval is 95%, based on known variance.
For the 5 contribution files selected, this represents 100% of the full population as shown with asterisk.

LEARNING & LITERACY

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	4	0	1	5*	100.0%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	3	0	2	5*	100.0%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	4	1	0	5*	80.0%	88.5%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	4	0	1	5*	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	3	2	0	5*	100.0%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	78.3%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	5	0	5*	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor, and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	5	0	0	5*	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	4	1	0	5*	80.0%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	3	2	0	5*	60.0%	68.7%
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	4	1	0	5*	80.0%	99.0%

The Learning & Literacy sample consists of 19 grant files and 5 contribution files. As indicated in the table, not all questions applied to these two types of transfer payments.

For the 19 grant files reviewed, the confidence interval is 95%, based on known variance.
For the 5 contribution files selected, this represents 100% of the full population as shown with asterisk.

LEARNING & LITERACY

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	0	1	4	5*	100.0%	99.1%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	94.3%
Math is correct on all claim forms	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	23	0	1	24	100.0%	98.5%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	23	0	1	24	100.0%	100.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	23	0	1	24	100.0%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	97.2%

MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	3	1	1	5*	75.0%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	3	0	2	5*	100.0%	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	3	0	2	5*	100.0%	97.1%
Follow-up issues outlined	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	96.3%
Follow-up initiated or completed	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	95.5%

The Learning & Literacy sample consists of 19 grant files and 5 contribution files. As indicated in the table, not all questions applied to these two types of transfer payments.

For the 19 grant files reviewed, the confidence interval is 95%, based on known variance.
For the 5 contribution files selected, this represents 100% of the full population as shown with asterisk.

LEARNING & LITERACY

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	2	0	3	5*	100.0%	97.6%
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	3	1	1	5*	75.0%	93.3%
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable, and recovery procedures initiated	1	0	4	5*	100.0%	60.0%
COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	24	0	0	24	100.0%	94.1%
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	24	0	0	24	100.0%	98.2%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	24	0	24	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	24	0	24	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	0	24	0	24	100.0%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	24	0	24	100.0%	99.5%

The Learning & Literacy sample consists of 19 grant files and 5 contribution files. As indicated in the table, not all questions applied to these two types of transfer payments.

For the 19 grant files reviewed, the confidence interval is 95%, based on known variance.
For the 5 contribution files selected, this represents 100% of the full population as shown with asterisk.

LEARNING & LITERACY

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
OTHER PTD RESULTS ***NOTE**: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*						
CONTRACTING						
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Reason for amendment is clear	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
PAYMENTS						
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended as required	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Financial visits' documentation is thorough and accurate	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	0	0	5	5*	N/A	N/A

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	4	1	0	5	80.0%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.1%
ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	5	0	0	5	100.0%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	3	2	0	5	60.0%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	5	0	0	5	100.0%	93.2%
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	1	0	4	5	100.0%	71.4%
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	1	0	4	5	100.0%	100.0%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.2%
RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	5	0	0	5	100.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	5	0	0	5	100.0%	92.9%

For Social Development Partnerships, the 5 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	5	0	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	5	0	0	5	100.0%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	5	0	0	5	100.0%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	5	0	0	5	100.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	5	0	0	5	100.0%	88.5%
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	1	0	4	5	100.0%	82.4%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	5	0	0	5	100.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	1	4	0	5	20.0%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	5	0	0	5	100.0%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	4	0	1	5	100.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	5	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	5	0	0	5	100.0%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	2	3	0	5	40.0%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	2	3	0	5	40.0%	68.7%
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	5	0	0	5	100.0%	99.0%

For Social Development Partnerships, the 5 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	4	0	1	5	100.0%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	3	0	2	5	100.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	0	3	2	5	100.0%	99.1%
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	1	1	3	5	50.0%	75.0%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	4	0	1	5	100.0%	94.3%
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	1	0	4	5	100.0%	100.0%
Math is correct on all claim forms	4	0	1	5	100.0%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	3	0	2	5	100.0%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.5%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	5	0	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast amended as required	3	0	2	5	100.0%	60.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	2	0	3	5	100.0%	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	2	0	3	5	100.0%	97.2%
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	1	0	4	5	100.0%	100.0%
MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	3	2	0	5	60.0%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	2	0	3	5	100.0%	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	4	0	1	5	100.0%	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	4	0	1	5	100.0%	97.1%
Financial visits documentation is thorough and accurate	1	0	4	5	100.0%	90.0%
Follow-up issues outlined	1	0	4	5	100.0%	96.3%
Follow-up initiated or completed	1	0	4	5	100.0%	95.5%

For Social Development Partnerships, the 5 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
FOLLOW UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	1	0	4	5	100.0%	100.0%
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	2	0	3	5	100.0%	97.6%
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	2	0	3	5	100.0%	93.3%

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	4	1	0	5	80.0%	94.1%

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	5	0	0	5	100.0%	98.2%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	5	0	5	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	5	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	0	5	0	5	100.0%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	5	0	5	100.0%	99.5%

For Social Development Partnerships, the 5 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
OTHER PTD RESULTS	*NOTE: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*					
CONTRACTING						
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
Reason for amendment is clear	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW UP & EVALUATION						
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable, and recovery procedures initiated	0	0	5	5	N/A	N/A

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR **Program** Results	2nd QPR **National** Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	3	4	0	7	42.9%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	7	0	0	7	100.0%	98.1%

ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	7	0	0	7	100.0%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	6	1	0	7	85.7%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	7	0	0	7	100.0%	93.2%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	7	0	0	7	100.0%	98.2%

RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	7	0	0	7	100.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	7	0	0	7	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	7	0	0	7	100.0%	92.9%

For Human Resource Partnerships, the 7 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	7	0	0	7	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	5	1	1	7	83.3%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	4	0	3	7	100.0%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	7	0	0	7	100.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	7	0	0	7	100.0%	88.5%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	7	0	0	7	100.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	7	0	0	7	100.0%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	7	0	0	7	100.0%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	7	0	0	7	100.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	3	0	4	7	100.0%	78.3%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	7	0	7	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	4	2	1	7	66.7%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	0	7	0	7	0.0%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	7	0	0	7	100.0%	68.7%

For Human Resource Partnerships, the 7 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING (cont'd)						
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	7	0	0	7	100.0%	99.0%
Reason for amendment is clear	2	0	5	7	100.0%	100.0%
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	2	0	5	7	100.0%	100.0%
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	1	0	6	7	100.0%	35.7%
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	1	1	5	7	50.0%	73.7%
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	1	0	6	7	100.0%	94.9%
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	4	0	3	7	100.0%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	4	0	3	7	100.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	0	4	3	7	100.0%	99.1%
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	1	0	6	7	100.0%	75.0%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	4	0	3	7	100.0%	94.3%
Math is correct on all claim forms	4	0	3	7	100.0%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	4	0	3	7	100.0%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	7	0	0	7	100.0%	98.5%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	7	0	0	7	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast amended as required	2	1	4	7	66.7%	60.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	6	0	1	7	100.0%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	6	1	0	7	85.7%	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	3	4	0	7	42.9%	97.2%
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	1	0	6	7	100.0%	100.0%

For Human Resource Partnerships, the 7 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	4	3	0	7	66.7%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	3	0	4	7	100.0%	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	4	0	3	7	100.0%	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	1	0	6	7	100.0%	97.1%
Financial visits' documentation is thorough and accurate	1	0	6	7	100.0%	90.0%
Follow-up issues outlined	4	0	3	7	100.0%	96.3%
Follow-up initiated or completed	3	0	4	7	100.0%	95.5%
FOLLOW UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	1	0	6	7	100.0%	100.0%
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	1	0	6	7	100.0%	97.6%
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	1	0	6	7	100.0%	93.3%
COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	7	0	0	7	100.0%	94.1%

For Human Resource Partnerships, the 7 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

HUMAN RESOURCE PARTNERSHIPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	7	0	0	7	100.0%	98.2%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	7	0	7	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	7	0	7	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	0	7	0	7	100.0%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	7	0	7	100.0%	99.5%

For Human Resource Partnerships, the 7 files selected represent 100% of the full population.

OTHER PTD RESULTS	*NOTE: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*					
ASSESSMENT						
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
All other mandatory consultation and concurrence on file	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
CONTRACTING						
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
PAYMENTS						
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal yea	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
MONITORING						
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable and recovery procedures initiated	0	0	7	7	N/A	N/A

LABOUR

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	2	0	0	2	100.0%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	2	0	0	2	100.0%	98.1%

ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	2	0	0	2	100.0%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	2	0	0	2	100.0%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	0	2	0	2	0.0%	93.2%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	98.2%

RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	2	0	0	2	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	2	0	0	2	100.0%	92.9%

For Labour, PTD reviewed 2 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

LABOUR

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	2	0	0	2	100.0%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	2	0	0	2	100.0%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	2	0	0	2	100.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	2	0	0	2	100.0%	88.5%
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	1	0	1	2	100.0%	82.4%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	2	0	0	2	100.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	2	0	0	2	100.0%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	2	0	0	2	100.0%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	2	0	0	2	100.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	2	0	2	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor, and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	2	0	0	2	100.0%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	2	0	0	2	100.0%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	0	2	0	2	0.0%	68.7%
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	2	0	0	2	100.0%	99.0%

For Labour, PTD reviewed 2 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

LABOUR

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	1	0	1	2	100.0%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation, if required by agreement	1	0	1	2	100.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	0	1	1	2	100.0%	99.1%
Claims match the expense categories allowed in the agreement	1	0	1	2	100.0%	94.3%
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	1	0	1	2	100.0%	100.0%
Math is correct on all claim forms	1	0	1	2	100.0%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	1	0	1	2	100.0%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	2	0	0	2	100.0%	98.5%
At least two people have initialled/signed/input/approved payment requisition	1	0	1	2	100.0%	100.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20, 2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	1	0	1	2	100.0%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	2	0	0	2	100.0%	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	2	0	0	2	100.0%	97.2%
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	1	0	1	2	100.0%	100.0%

MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	1	0	1	2	100.0%	89.3%

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	2	0	0	2	100.0%	94.1%

For Labour, PTD reviewed 2 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

LABOUR

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	2	0	0	2	100.0%	98.2%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	2	0	2	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	2	0	2	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	0	2	0	2	100.0%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	2	0	2	100.0%	99.5%
OTHER PTD RESULTS *NOTE: Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.*						
ASSESSMENT						
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
CONTRACTING						
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Reason for amendment is clear	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
PAYMENTS						
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Cashflow forecast amended as required	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final Claim form, unless justified on file	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable, and recovery procedures initiated	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project	0	0	2	2	N/A	N/A

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	**Answers**				**2nd QPR Program Results**	**2nd QPR National Results**
	Yes	**No**	**N/A**	**Total**	**Compliance Level**	**Compliance Level**
APPLICATION						
Application for funding from sponsor on file	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.1%
Application was signed by representative of submitting organization	6	2	0	8	75.0%	97.2%
Includes objectives and activities	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.5%
Includes a cost estimate	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.1%
Includes explanation of results to be achieved	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.1%
ASSESSMENT						
The written assessment demonstrates that activity supports program objectives	8	0	0	8	100.0%	87.2%
Assessment documentation indicates that proposed cost (economy) was considered	6	2	0	8	75.0%	74.4%
Sponsor was checked for outstanding debt to HRDC	7	1	0	8	87.5%	93.2%
There is formal confirmation of essential funding from other sources	1	0	7	8	100.0%	71.4%
Environmental assessment addressed adequately in file	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.2%
RECOMMENDATION & APPROVAL						
Rationale/analysis for funding on file	8	0	0	8	100.0%	95.4%
Approval signed with correct delegation of authority	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.6%
Approval signed on or prior to project start date	8	0	0	8	100.0%	92.9%

For Official Languages for Minority Groups, PTD reviewed 8 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING						
Agreement is on file	8	0	0	8	100.0%	100.0%
Objectives include measurable timelines/milestones	8	0	0	8	100.0%	90.5%
Objectives include measurable statement of quantity	8	0	0	8	100.0%	94.4%
Expected results are described clearly	8	0	0	8	100.0%	95.5%
Services and/or activities are described clearly	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.0%
Nature of authorized expenses is clear	8	0	0	8	100.0%	88.5%
Agreement reflects all approval conditions	2	0	6	8	100.0%	82.4%
The schedule and basis of payment are clear in the agreement	2	6	0	8	25.0%	75.0%
Agreement contains a clause that HRDC may do an audit of costs claimed	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.0%
Agreement includes provisions for agreement termination with cause, and agreement termination without cause	8	0	0	8	100.0%	97.5%
Agreement states the requirement for the recipient to repay overpayments, unexpended balances, and disallowed expenses	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.0%
Text of the agreement matches the program utilized	8	0	0	8	100.0%	95.5%
All necessary schedules are included and properly prepared	8	0	0	8	100.0%	87.9%
Duration of agreement is stated	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement includes statement regarding disposition of project revenue	4	0	4	8	100.0%	78.3%
Agreement value exceeds approval amount	0	8	0	8	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast on file, if necessary, appropriate to contracted activities, signed by sponsor and in agreement with HRDC contracted total	8	0	0	8	100.0%	95.2%
Agreement signed on or after project approval date	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.5%
Agreement signed on or prior to agreement start date	5	3	0	8	62.5%	84.0%
Commitment completed prior to HRDC signing agreement	8	0	0	8	100.0%	68.7%

For Official Languages for Minority Groups, PTD reviewed 8 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
CONTRACTING (cont'd)						
Signed in all required places by HRDC official with correct delegation of authority	8	0	0	8	100.0%	99.0%
Reason for amendment is clear	4	0	4	8	100.0%	100.0%
Approval for increase amendments was signed with correct delegation of authority	3	0	5	8	100.0%	100.0%
In the case of financial increase amendments, commitment certification was completed prior to HRDC signing amendment	1	0	7	8	100.0%	35.7%
Cashflow forecast amended for financial amendments, where required	1	1	6	8	50.0%	73.7%
Amendments signed with correct delegation of authority	4	0	4	8	100.0%	94.9%
PAYMENTS						
All required claim forms are on file	6	0	2	8	100.0%	97.6%
Claims are accompanied by activity report and supporting financial documentation if required by Agreement	4	0	4	8	100.0%	97.8%
Claim periods overlap	0	6	2	8	100.0%	99.1%
If claims exceed maximum allowable per category, HRDC approval is on file	0	1	7	8	0.0%	75.0%
Claims match the expense categories allowed the agreement	5	0	3	8	100.0%	94.3%
Claim amounts for April support the advance amount issued from the previous fiscal year	2	0	6	8	100.0%	100.0%
Math is correct on all claim forms	6	0	2	8	100.0%	98.8%
Claim forms are correctly signed by sponsor	6	0	2	8	100.0%	98.8%
Correct delegation of authority according to Section 34 and proper counter signature	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.5%
At least two people have initialed/signed/input/approved payment requisition	8	0	0	8	100.0%	100.0%
Cashflow forecast amended as required	1	4	3	8	20.0%	60.0%
As per the 5-point ADM directive (Jan 20,2000), the file was certified for compliance before further payments were issued	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.3%
If advance issued, sponsor was eligible for advance	5	3	0	8	62.5%	96.3%
Advance amounts are within Treasury Board limits	7	1	0	8	87.5%	97.2%
Only April forecasted expenditures are paid out of old year funds	2	0	6	8	100.0%	100.0%

For Official Languages for Minority Groups, PTD reviewed 8 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
MONITORING						
A risk assessment or monitoring plan, completed at agreement start, is on file	5	3	0	8	62.5%	87.9%
Monitoring has been done according to plan	1	2	5	8	33.3%	89.3%
Monitoring report(s) on file	2	0	6	8	100.0%	97.5%
Project activities were monitored for compliance with agreement	1	0	7	8	100.0%	97.1%
Financial visits documentation is thorough and accurate	1	1	6	8	50.0%	90.0%
Follow-up issues outlined	1	0	7	8	100.0%	96.3%
Follow-up initiated or completed	1	0	7	8	100.0%	95.5%

FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION						
Procedures for disposal of assets are clear	1	0	7	8	100.0%	100.0%

COMPLIANCE WITH TERMS & CONDITIONS						
Activities meet program terms and conditions	8	0	0	8	100.0%	94.1%

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
As per the February 11, 2000 Senior ADM directive, a life cycle file review checklist is completed and on file	8	0	0	8	100.0%	98.2%
HRDC is exercising inappropriate supervisory control and employer/employee relationship may be a problem	0	8	0	8	100.0%	99.5%
There are risks related to contravention of the *Public Service Employment Act*	0	8	0	8	100.0%	100.0%
There are risks related to improper use of contribution funds because the project is supplying goods or services to HRDC	0	8	0	8	100.0%	96.8%
There are risks related to liability and public perception	0	8	0	8	100.0%	99.5%

For Official Languages for Minority Groups, PTD reviewed 8 files, this represents 100% of the full population.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Questions/Criteria Assessment	Answers				2nd QPR Program Results	2nd QPR National Results
	Yes	No	N/A	Total	Compliance Level	Compliance Level
***NOTE:* Not statistically valid due to low numbers reviewed. Provided for information purposes only.**						
OTHER PTD RESULTS						
MONITORING	0	0	8	8	N/A	N/A
Contributions from other partners were verified on financial visit						
FOLLOW-UP & EVALUATION	0	0	8	8	N/A	N/A
Assets were disposed of as agreed in file	0	0	8	8	N/A	N/A
The full contribution was paid after receipt of the final claim form, unless justified on file	0	0	8	8	N/A	N/A
Overpayment has been recorded as a receivable and recovery procedures initiated	0	0	8	8	N/A	N/A
Summary of outcomes is included on file at the end of project						